

the State's allotment of appropriated funds in excess of \$100 million.

The BLATNIK bill also provides that the allotment of funds to the State in excess of any appropriations over \$100 million yearly will be made solely on the basis of population. Finally, it increases the annual authorization for this work to \$150 million.

It seems to me that Congress must weigh carefully the impact of this larger authorization on the problem I have described.

Is \$60 million for demonstration projects sufficient to tackle the problem of storm and sanitary sewer separation? Do we really need more studies and demonstration projects in this area? Is it not self-evident that combined sewers are a major source of contamination, and that any separation project is certain to alleviate pollution problems? I think this is one area where we could get on with the work with a much larger expenditure.

How about the treatment plant program? Will \$150 million per year from the Federal Government do the job, or could more be used to advantage?

We know that there is a backlog of about \$2.6 billion worth of waste collection and treatment projects. If our goal is to clean up municipal wastes by 1970, an annual expenditure of \$830 million would be required. It seems to me that some careful study should be given to the ability of States and municipalities to match additional Federal funds. If they can do so at a rate greater than \$150 million a year, Congress should consider very thoughtfully an appropriation equal to whatever can be used.

Beyond this, there is the problem of obsolescence. Many older systems must be replaced as the years go by; in particular, I might suggest, those systems that are now using inferior though inexpensive pipe. The wise planners who start with good clay pipe will not have that worry.

It may seem strange to some that the ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, the man who is usually talking about cutting the budget, is talking today about larger expenditures. But I have often said that we must learn to distinguish our needs from our wants. We must review Federal programs on the basis of what is required for the Nation, and what may be only desirable.

If we agree that protecting our water resource is perhaps the most fundamental requirement for our future growth and well-being, then I suggest that we can devote maximum effort on this program, foregoing some of the things that are less essential.

Summing up, it seems to me that we have these things to do:

First, we must continue to dramatize and publicize the problem. The President has set the course by using the Potomac as an example of what can and must be done. If the American people recognize the nature of the problem, they will support any effort that is required to correct it.

Second, we must continue our research, but we must also be quicker to put our new knowledge into action. We have studied enough to know pollution when we see it. We know when it gets out of hand. We know what causes it. Now let us work to achieve standards in pollution enforcement measures that will pinpoint sources of pollution quickly and set up methods to correct them with dispatch.

Third, we must encourage the States to enter into interstate programs for control of entire river systems and lakes. Again I will mention Orsanco as an example of what can be done, and Governor Rhodes' Great Lakes Conference as an example of what must be done to tackle the job ahead.

Fourth, we must provide Federal support equal to the maximum capabilities of the municipalities and the States.

Competent authorities have testified that the States may be able to match up to \$175 million in Federal funds next year and as much as \$200 million in the years following. Certainly this should be thoroughly investigated.

And we should do it all with clay pipe. It gives me a really deep satisfaction to come here today when you are honoring JOHN BLATNIK, and to join with you in recognizing his leadership in this field. As you all know, JOHN is a Democrat and I am a Republican, and on many issues we have quite different views. I'm certain that would be apparent in any study of the roll-call votes in the House. But there are also issues on which partisanship is not a factor, and we have been discussing one of them today. All of us in the House recognize JOHN BLATNIK as the expert and the leader of the causes and cures of water pollution. I am glad to support him every way that I can, and I am doubly glad to be with you today and to join in this well-deserved recognition of JOHN's magnificent achievement. Generations of Americans are in his debt.

Helicopter Service in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 the President's budget message called for an end to Federal subsidies in support of passenger helicopter operations throughout the country. I question whether such immediate withdrawal of support is the wisest move at this point in the development of helicopter service.

To quote a New York Times editorial of February 6:

Any Government subsidy must, of course, be submitted to unremitting review. But it would be most unfortunate and shortsighted to stop the subsidy of helicopter passenger service at this stage. For one thing, the Pan Am heliport itself, because of its great convenience, should encourage an immediate increase in passenger use to make trips to airports in 5 to 10 minutes that might require an hour or more by highway. If, as likely, the proposed new fourth major airport in the area is situated even further away, the helicopter's time advantage will be enhanced.

While the helicopter service would probably be unable to exist this year or next without support, it seems that the great increase in recent years of public support and usage points to a time in the very near future when such service would be able to pay for itself. New York Airways when it started its operations 12 years ago carried approximately 25 passengers daily. Today that figure is up to 1,000 daily. As recently as 1958 subsidies received were 72.9 percent of all revenues received by New York Airways. In 1964 other commercial income had grown so that only 45 percent of all revenues came from Government subsidy. In 1965, this will drop to 34.8 percent and in subsequent years it will fall to 23.6 percent, finally in 1970 to 3.5 percent.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has proposed a plan for ending subsidy which takes account of this attenuating need as well as the requirement of Government economy. This program would gradually phase out aid to the heliports between now and 1970 and offer only the barest subsidy needed to match increasing profits.

I support this plan because I believe it will enable the needed convenience of helicopter service to survive, yet will call for the minimum of Federal funds necessary to do this.

We must remember that we have a large investment in this service. The Federal Government has spent \$46.7 million in the past 11 years in fostering the growth of the program. To cut off aid now would be to nip it in the bud and render our previous investment useless. The Civil Aeronautics Board program would call for a small amount of additional funds to complete our investment and would allow that investment to reap the dividend of self-sufficient service that was our original goal and which promises to be an imminent reality.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used these words from Colossians 3: 1: *If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above.*

O Thou great God of all mankind, may this day be rich and glorious in the revelation and realization of Thy presence,

Thy peace, and Thy power to strengthen and sustain us as we confront unforeseen and unknown experiences.

Inspire us with faith and hope for we are encountering difficult domestic and foreign problems and may our lives be the centers of sympathy and friendship, of peace, and good will.

Fill us with a passionate longing to minister to the welfare of needy humanity, lifting and leading all who dwell in darkness and bondage into the light and liberty of the sons of God.

Grant that as we observe the blessed Easter season, commemorating the resurrection of our Lord, we may rise with Him unto veriness of spirit and be victorious over everything that undermines man's character and corrupts his soul.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE 89TH CONGRESS 1ST HUNDRED DAYS AND THE JOHNSON PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 32 years ago, in the depths of the most horrible and devastating depression ever to wreak havoc on civilization, a new administration took office in this country. Under the leadership of a dynamic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Congress swung into action. Within a period of a short 100 days our National Legislature produced a flood of legislation designed to meet the crisis of the day.

The impact of that virtuoso congressional performance became so deeply ingrained in our national consciousness that it has become almost a ritual for us to appraise every President's first hundred days. Fortunately, President Lyndon B. Johnson entered into his first complete administration without the cruel spur of terrible domestic tragedy. It is therefore all the more to his credit and to the credit of the Congress that the first hundred days of this 89th Congress has produced so splendid a legislative record.

President Johnson promised the American people that he would lead them toward the Great Society. To do so, he required the closest cooperation on the part of Congress. We in these legislative halls can proudly say that we have not rejected the challenge he offered.

Congress in these hundred days has completed action on 10 major pieces of legislation. It has made a grand start in the battle to eliminate poverty by passing the Appalachia Assistance Act. It has added to our forces in that battle by expanding and extending the Manpower Training Act.

We have agreed to a most tremendous and worthwhile investment in our future by passing the law to aid elementary and secondary education.

In the cause of peace, we have passed bills providing for additional contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank and for a 3-year extension of the Disarmament Act.

To maintain the health of our economy and of our international financial standing, we have passed a gold cover law.

Agriculture has not been forgotten. Congress has already enacted the tobacco acreage bill and a \$1.6 billion agricultural supplemental bill.

For our defense we have already disposed of a \$114.2 million Coast Guard authorization. For the better operation of our Government we have passed a proposal for a constitutional amendment relating to Presidential succession.

In addition to this impressive record of legislation already achieved, a water resources planning program is in conference between the two houses.

Finally, this House of Representatives has acted on two further great measures, a Drug Control Act, and the bill to extend our social security program and to offer medical care to the aged.

Our work is not yet done. But we have made a start. In President Johnson's words, "We are moving," and we shall continue to move until every portion of his great program is enacted into law.

ADJOURNMENT SCHEDULE OVER THE EASTER HOLIDAYS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next and that when the House adjourns on Monday next the 19th it adjourn to meet on Thursday next the 22d and that when it adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet the following Monday, the 26th.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday, April 28 may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 26

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the week following the Easter holidays.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield, the program for the week beginning April 26 is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no District bills. Under a previous order of the House, the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called on April 26. There are no suspensions.

On Tuesday H.R. 6497, increasing the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States will be considered under an open rule with 2 hours of debate. House Resolution 317, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction will also be considered.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, the bill S. 4, Water Quality Act of 1965, under an open rule waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate, and H.R. 4714, amending the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of

1964, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I submit the following letter from William Netschert, M.E., one of my constituents:

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA.,
April 6, 1965.

Hon. A. S. HERLONG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. HERLONG: Please convey to your colleagues of the Committee on Ways and Means my admiration for the tremendous job which was accomplished in the preparation of your collective determinations of what should be the content of H.R. 6675, Social Security Amendments of 1965.

I write this despite my total and complete disagreement with the philosophy demonstrated in the table for determining primary insurance amounts and maximum family benefits up to 1970 and for months after 1970.

If I am correct in my assumption, without direct reference to the statute, that minimum eligibility of \$50 per average quarter gives entitlement to a pension of \$40 per month, I can continue to regard this as a corruption of the principles of equity in insurance, which no commissioner of any State would dare allow that industry to practice under his regulation. The ratio of pension to minimum eligibility wages will continue to be 240 percent at \$40 per month in retirement. The act of 1939, recapitulated on page 164 of H.R. 6675, showed a variation in that ratio from 81 percent at \$50 per quarter to 18 percent at \$250 per month. The proposed rates of pensions on average wages now vary from 264 percent, at minimum eligibility, to 31.5 percent which the maximum pension of \$127 is compared to \$403—and 33.5 percent which the proposed pension is of \$403, while the maximum pension of \$149 will become only 32 percent of \$466, up to the end of 1970. Then thereafter your recommendation to Congress calls for, in column 4, a maximum pension of \$168 on wages of \$550, which takes the ratio down to about 30.55 percent. This, I pointed out in petition No. 851 to the 88th Congress, when the discrimination ratio was about 8 to 1. Now your committee proposes a spread of monetary discrimination at 8.65 to 1.

Again I want to repeat what I quoted from Dean Brown, of Princeton, who was writing for the October 1960 issue of Industrial and Labor Relations Review (published on the campus of Cornell University):

"The state, in order to assure a self-reliant and responsible citizenry necessary for democratic government, agreed to enter (in 1935, he seems to mean) upon a mutually advantageous contract with each productive citi-

zen. In effect, a contract of cooperation replaced the age-old paternalistic obligation, at least for a large segment of our people." On this I now ask your committee: Did it? And does it now? And will you be doing that in 1970? Dean Brown continued later in his essay on "The Role of Social Insurance in the United States":

"The absence of conscious understanding of the concept of cooperative contract in American social insurance programs is most likely to cause error when persons in high places (sic the Committee on Ways and Means), with the best of intentions, propose modifications in the program which alter this basic concept. This has already occurred (mind you) in the emergency legislation of 1958 to extend unemployment insurance benefits as a substitute for relief." Now I would like to put this question to the Ways and Means Committee: What is this discrimination in monetary determinations of pensions on past wages but a substitute for relief, as a matter of right by law.

So, for the benefit of a harassed committee, I now offer Dean Brown's "Guidelines for Future Policy" (and I remind the committee he was a member of the advisory council which has just this winter filed its 1965 report):

"The problem of the future role of social insurance in America is that of testing out how far and into what areas of individual economic risk the concept of cooperative contract (which this bill most certainly is not) between the citizen and the state should be extended. The concept does not stand alone as an absolute good, but must be weighed against other political and social concepts which have long contributed to the progress of America. Among these other concepts are:

- "1. The need for individual incentive;
- "2. The advantage of private corporate enterprise, particularly in insurance, as opposed to, public enterprise.
- "3. The integrity of the family and the value of mutual support as tangible manifestations of a spiritual relationship;
- "4. The dignity and responsibility of the individual as opposed to growing sanctions of the state."

In view of what was done in the 88th Congress at the very time a second memorial from the Florida Legislature was on its way to emphasize the meaning of its 1961 memorial, I now exercise my right of citizenship to ask your colleagues: What more could you have done to violate the principles of fiduciary integrity of government than by the sanctions of monetary discrimination you have designed against the best producers of our economy?

I respectfully request you make this part of the RECORD of the 89th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM NETSCHERT, M. E.,
Employment Security Consultant, 1961
and 1963 Florida Legislatures, and
Past President and Honorary Member-in-Retirement, central New Jersey Statistical Society at Princeton.

PROTECTION OF ALASKA'S FISHERIES

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, within a few weeks fleets of Japanese fishing vessels are expected to begin an intensive harvest of red salmon on the high seas—salmon spawned in large

numbers in Alaska's Bristol Bay region. This high seas salmon harvest, would, if carried out, disrupt Alaska's well-established, sustained yield, salmon management program and be destructive of the economy of the salmon-dependent Bristol Bay area and ruinous to all those associated with it.

And these tragic consequences would be worked on America by a nation that has done nothing to conserve the north Pacific fishery, a nation that has done nothing to make the fishery abundant. These consequences would be worked on America by a nation that wants only to harvest the resource for profitable export to other nations.

The administration has diligently and patiently negotiated with Japan in an effort to secure needed limitations upon her high seas fishery. These negotiations, however, have not been successful, and though they continue, there appears little prospect that they will be. And even if successful results might be obtained, say, in a few months, that would be too late.

If we are to preserve our salmon fisheries, it is not enough to practice sound conservation. We must also make certain that such conservation efforts are not made meaningless through high seas fishing by others.

Protection of our fisheries against the destructive effects of high seas fishing must come through legislation. And, the time for that legislation is now.

To point up the urgency of action now to save our fisheries, let me describe more fully the tragic case of the Bristol Bay red salmon fishery, and the threat posed to it today by Japanese high seas fishing.

The International North Pacific Fisheries Convention, ratified by Canada, Japan, and the United States in 1954, drew a provisional line far out in the Pacific Ocean—at 175° west longitude—to exclude the Japanese from catching American-spawned salmon. Under the terms of the convention, Japan was to abstain from fishing for salmon east of that line which was to be called the "abstention line" as long as Canada and the United States continued to fully utilize and regulate the fishery.

Although Japan has not violated that line by fishing east of it, Japan has taken American-spawned salmon on the high seas, because experience has shown that such salmon, especially Bristol Bay reds, do migrate and feed west of the line. Japan has abided by the line, but ignored its intent by taking full advantage of the situation in terms of fishing and by blocking any amendment of the convention to rectify the matter.

Now that the International North Pacific Fisheries Convention has expired, the United States has endeavored, in negotiations for a renewal of the convention, to relocate the abstention line farther west. Thus far the Japanese will consent to no such change and will not even reaffirm the abstention principle.

Over the past 10 years, the Japanese have taken on the high seas about 30 percent of the total catch of Bristol Bay red salmon. In 1964 alone they took about 2 million fish, a very substantial number of which were immature.

The effect, then, of the Japanese high seas fishery is of two kinds. First, by depriving American fishermen of the opportunity to harvest millions of American-spawned salmon, within Alaska's territorial waters under strict conservation practices, it brings poverty and hardship upon them. Secondly, the Japanese high seas fishery reduces future runs of salmon by the taking of immature fish, defeating replenishment and other conservation efforts being made by Americans. In short it leads to destruction of Alaska's Bristol Bay salmon fishery.

Of the predicted 1965 run of 27 million Bristol Bay red salmon, there should be escapement of 12 million for spawning. If the remaining 15 million fish could make up the catch of the Bristol Bay fishermen, their season's work could be profitable. They could repay the debts they incurred during the past three seasons of runs reduced by Japanese catches.

Tragic to report, however, the Bristol Bay fishermen may not look forward to a good season, but instead must anticipate catastrophe. For press reports from Japan indicate that the Japanese motherships will be operating in the area west of 175° west longitude where a substantial portion of the Bristol Bay red salmon will be concentrated. An intensive high seas effort by the Japanese could reduce the Bristol Bay run by 5 to 7 million fish.

If this happens, Mr. Speaker, there will be economic disaster for the Bristol Bay fishermen, packers, and cannery employees, and the Bristol Bay fishery will be another step closer to extinction.

In order that this not happen, I urge my colleagues to give their support to legislation that will conserve and protect Pacific salmon.

I have introduced a bill that would permit the President to increase the duty on any fishery product from a country whose vessels are being used in a way that diminish the effectiveness of our conservation programs for Pacific salmon of North American origin whenever the Secretary of Interior finds that such deleterious practices are in fact occurring. The increased duty could not be more than 50 percent of the rate existing on July 1, 1934.

I recognize that passage of this bill would appear unfriendly to Japan, and constitute economic pressure toward obtaining her cooperation in the North Pacific, but the interest of our people dependent upon the Bristol Bay fishery—today and for many years hence—demands that this legislation be enacted and approved.

The time is past for discussion. If we are to make our conservation program meaningful, and protect the livelihood of American fishermen, it is imperative that we act now.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill for the establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, a 30-mile stretch of the Oregon coastline which contains the finest examples of coastal dunes in the Nation, and which merited mention in the President's February 8 message to the Congress on natural beauty.

During the 88th Congress I also had a bill pending for the establishment of this seashore, on which hearings were held in Oregon. I have labored many weeks reshaping the bill to remove some objections stated at these hearings and to conform more closely to the version reported out by the Senate Interior Committee in November 1963. I believe that I now have a bill which will both provide an Oregon Dunes National Seashore of which all the American people can be proud and which all can use and enjoy and which will, at the same time, allow the continued economic and industrial development of the nearby coastal communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt whatsoever that eventually there will be an Oregon Dunes National Seashore. For nearly a decade this issue has been before the Congress and has been a matter of concern to the local citizens and property owners in the area. Quite naturally, it has kept these people in a constant state of unrest. With this in mind, I think it only fair that we should put this matter to rest by taking prompt action on the bill, establishing the national seashore, and allowing the orderly development of the area to proceed as it should.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 13, it was my privilege to attend a conference of farm organization leaders in Kansas City, Mo., sponsored by the Missouri Farmers Association.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman addressed the group on Tuesday morning. His remarks on that occasion, in my opinion, present the story of American agriculture in a way that would enable any listener, regardless of his background, to clearly understand the accomplishments we have made in American agriculture and the problems and opportunities which face us. I commend the Secretary's remarks, not only to my colleagues, but to every American who wants a better understanding of the purposes and goals of our farm programs and policies.

There is no field of Government activity about which there is less under-

standing and more confusion. All of us who are elected to represent the producers, processors, sellers, and consumers of agricultural products have a deep responsibility to gain the best understanding possible of all phases of American agriculture. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to give their careful consideration to the Secretary's remarks, which follow:

ADDRESS BY MR. FREEMAN

Recently, the leaders of the Soviet Union announced their willingness to spend \$75 billion in order to have the kind of problems in agriculture that we have in the United States.

And what are those problems?

American families, on the average, spend less than 19 percent of their takehome pay for food. We spend more for housing and home furnishing than we do for food, while food costs in many countries still take over half or more of what people earn. If the American farmer was no more efficient than before World War II, the American consumer would be paying about 17 billion more for farm products each year.

Less than 8 percent of the American people produce the food and fiber for all the rest. Other Americans released from agriculture are thus able to produce the infinite variety of goods and services which provide us with the highest standard of living any people have ever known. In many countries, farming is still the means of existence—or subsistence—for most people.

The United States exports each year over \$6 billion worth of farm products, including over \$1.5 billion worth which we share with other countries to fight hunger and starvation. Agriculture last year contributed about \$2.3 billion to the dollar earning of the United States abroad.

Each year, for the past 4 years, the abundance of food produced by the farmer has been shared with over 6 million Americans who otherwise would have had less than an adequate diet.

American agriculture is the base on which rests the jobs and profits for nearly 12 million Americans and hundreds of thousands of businesses. The farmer and his family spend about \$40 million a year for goods and services, and the products of the farm make possible an \$80 billion a year food industry.

On the basis of these facts, it is clear that American agriculture, far from being a problem, is the greatest success story of our times. And this is why the Russians are willing to spend billions, for they want the same benefits that we enjoy from an abundant agriculture.

Whether they will achieve success is another question. It can be said without reservation that our success is no accident—nor is it alone the product of a substantial investment of money. Our agriculture is a freehold family-farm system that not only rejected Old World feudalism, but also has outproduced and outshone the 20th century agriculture feudalism created in the name of communism.

Our success in agriculture is the result of enterprise and hard work on the part of American families who took risks and invested their capital and their life's work.

Public policy also has played a key role. The Nation fostered family farm agriculture through land grants, the Homestead Act, the land-grant colleges and universities, the founding of the USDA, and a host of programs which foster family farm agriculture.

The action of the Russian leaders, while it flatters our ego, accentuates the vital importance of agriculture in a way that all people—farmers and nonfarmers alike—can understand.

Food is survival—and we should never become so well fed that we forget it. A productive agriculture is basic to industrial society—and we should never become so industrialized that we forget it. A strong agriculture is necessary to economic growth—and we should never grow so big that we forget that.

But while our success is no accident, neither is it inevitable. And that is what I want to discuss here today.

The greatest threat to the continued abundance provided by family farm agriculture can be said in very few words. Fewer than 400,000 farmers today out of more than 3 million receive near parity of income—the equivalent of the wages of skilled labor (\$2.46 an hour) and a 5-percent return on investment. Most do not even earn the minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour.

In the absence of a fair return in agriculture, we will not, in the long run, get the people and the resources we must have in farming if the abundance we enjoy today is to be assured for tomorrow.

I believe the American people understand this fact, and will support constructive action designed to keep a productive commercial family farm agriculture—and that means effective commodity programs.

In recent months, I have been encouraged by the evidence of better understanding which the American people have shown toward agriculture and the farmer. I believe the message of the real bargain we enjoy in food is getting through, and I find that the burden of the label of surplus and subsidy that Ezra Taft Benson left behind him is being lifted from the farmer as understanding grows, and as practical steps are taken to reduce our surpluses. I believe the American consumer, if approached with fair and sensible reasons, will agree that the farmer is entitled to a fair return in the marketplace just like labor and business and the professions.

Lauren Sotb, the distinguished editorial director of the Des Moines newspapers, made the same point recently in another way. He said the objection to measures which provide a way to maintain farm income have come "from certain farm organizations and agriculture-related industries which have a stake in large volume farm production, and from theorists who see such regulations as beyond the pale of prescribed doctrine of free enterprise. There has been talk of farm price support legislation being a 'bread tax' on consumers. So far as I have been able to find, this protest does not come from consumers." And he based his findings on a review of material published over the last 10 years by labor unions, consumer groups and urban groups which "failed to produce significant examples of protest against farmers because of high food costs."

This conclusion underscores a belief expressed by many people sympathetic to the need of family farm agriculture. It is that if we fail to provide the kind of public policy which will insure a fair return in agriculture, the general public will not be at fault as much as the community of agricultural leaders.

Let me explain.

There are a great many people willing to support the efforts of commercial family farm agriculture to obtain a fair income in return for the abundance the Nation enjoys. This support comes not so much from an emotional attachment to the family farm system as from a growing understanding of the vital importance of agriculture and the family farm system to the national welfare.

During the presidential election last year, for example, it was clearly understood that one of the specific issues was whether or not farm commodity programs would continue to be an instrument of national economic policy to maintain farm income during this

period of enormous adjustment in agriculture. One view held that commodity programs should be phased out as quickly as possible. The other view held that commodity programs were essential if the supply of farm products was to be kept in reasonable balance with the demand so that farm income would not drop from about \$12.5 billion to about \$6 billion.

The elections last November were a decisive mandate for the latter position. A President sympathetic to agriculture was overwhelmingly elected, and a new Congress in which agriculture and rural America have substantially more supporters than the previous one was sent to Washington.

President Johnson, in his message on agriculture and in his letter this week transmitting the administration's farm proposals, summarized the need for price and income support programs this way. He said:

"For more than three decades, and particularly since the end of World War II, the United States has experienced a staggering revolution in the techniques of farming. Science and technology, applied to agronomy and animal husbandry, have brought the American people a greater abundance of food and fiber than the citizens of any nation in history have ever known. Prior to the Second World War, farming productivity was increasing at only half the rate of industrial growth; but since 1945, it has increased at twice the speed of industrial growth.

"For three decades we have had programs which, by one means or another, have sought to achieve a balance between supply and demand. Born in the emergency of the 1930's, they have countered the income-depressing potential of the revolution in agricultural production.

"Our farm programs must always be adapted to the requirements of the future. Today, they should be focused more precisely on the opportunity for parity of income for America's family farmers and lower Government costs. But we must recognize that farm programs will be necessary as long as the advance in agricultural technology continues to outpace the growth of population at home and markets abroad."

Thus, in 1965, at a time when the American farmer is the beneficiary of improved public understanding, and has the support of a President actively committed to his welfare, and can go to a Congress sympathetic to his needs, it would seem that passing farm legislation would be a breeze.

But such is not the case. Instead, it is likely that not one commodity program would be extended by the Congress if the vote were taken today. This currently bleak picture is the product of disunity in agriculture's own house, of friction which fritters away our strength because it confuses and disillusiones our friends.

This disunity in agriculture's house takes many forms.

For some, it reflects a belief in the free market so strong as to almost constitute a theocracy which forbids any kind of governmental activity even at the expense of destroying the family farm system. But we have overcome these extremists before, and we can do it again.

Other kinds of disunity are more dangerous.

Competing interests among producers on the same farm commodity threaten agriculture's house as never before. The most recent example of this was an editorial in a Midwest newspaper complaining that Federal programs failed to give preference to the superior wheat produced in its area of influence over the inferior wheat produced in the Northwest. The reverse sentiment is held by the Northwest. Similarly, the cotton growers of the Southeast cannot agree on policy with the growers in the delta, and neither of these groups want the same thing as high plains growers in Texas or irrigation

farmers in California. The same kind of divisions create abrasive relations among tobacco farmers, rice growers, and peanut producers, and are potential sources of division in the case of practically every commodity produced in this country.

Such divisions are understandable, for there are legitimate differences which flow from competition between regions and between varieties as each seeks an improved position. However, vigorous competition should not overshadow the legitimate interests of the farmer and his family—North, South, East, and West—in a decent income. This is a big and boisterous country with room for a great many differences, but those differences should not be allowed to block national action which is essential to the welfare of every farmer, particularly this year when important farm commodity programs await congressional action.

The third area of division is the most difficult—and dangerous—of all, for it is the product of the massive and irreversible changes now underway throughout agriculture. Many farmers have little to show for their work and sweat at the end of a year. Their income is low. Yet they see a nation becoming more prosperous around them, and their frustration grows as they fail to share in it. When they try to increase their efficiency the cost of new equipment, chemicals, and other production items consume much of the increase in income. They seem, like Alice in the book "Through the Looking Glass," to be running faster and faster just to stay in the same place.

As frustration mounts, disillusion sets in. Many farmers lash out at farm programs that don't seem to go far enough or at farm leaders who don't seem to do enough. Such a reaction is understandable. The fact that it exists calls for action. But it doesn't mean that we should abandon commodity programs. It does mean that farm leaders must develop programs which are at the same time acceptable to the country and responsive to the complex needs of agriculture and all who farm today. Such programs must give more than hope, they must give promise that the opportunity for parity of income for the efficient family farmer will be realized. This will require greater maturity and better leadership than ever before.

The country cannot afford the terrible cost of ending commodity programs, nor can agriculture indulge the luxury of demanding the impossible. The end result of both extremes is the same. Either way the farmer will lose, and the country will lose, for our commodity programs will be lost.

Everyone here had a part in developing the legislative program which the President sent to Congress last week. It can meet the test of public acceptability if understood. It will meet the test of solid progress toward parity of income if passed by the Congress. It can be passed if everyone in this room gets solidly behind the program and works hard for it during the next several months. Its proposals are geared especially to—

Maintain and improve farm income;

Make greater use of the marketplace in domestic and export sales, relying less on tax dollars, and moving away from the use of export subsidies;

Assist small farmers by giving them special consideration in commodity programs wherever possible;

Help small farmers with the capacity and desire for growth to acquire the resources they need for an adequate size family farm operation, and at the same time help those who seek to earn a decent living in other than farming or who wish to retire to receive fair and just compensation for their assets; and

Provide the instrument for long-range adjustments in agricultural resources, recognizing that the need for balancing the supply

of farm commodities with the demand will be of long duration.

Cut cost of farm programs, freeing resources so that the war on poverty, such as the food stamp plan, can be adequately funded.

The proposed wheat and rice legislation will mean higher incomes for farmers than the current programs. At the same time, the cost of the programs will be lowered. The tax dollars which are saved can go to finance the war on poverty, including the food stamp program which will make an adequate diet available to as many as 4 million needy Americans in the next few years. The increased value of the wheat certificate, if passed on to the consumer, might raise the cost of wheat in a loaf of bread by about seven-tenths of a cent (and in the case of rice would add 2 or 3 cents to the farm cost of a pound of rice). Should this happen the total effect would be to increase the costs of food which an average person consumes in a week by about 3.6 cents.

It can properly be asked: Will this be an imposition on consumers? I think not, and for these reasons: In the past 4 years the proportion of income an average American family spends for food has decreased as take-home pay has sharply climbed; both the quantity and quality of surplus food distributed directly to needy families have been greatly improved, and over 6 million persons now receive a better diet; by the end of the summer the food stamp program will have enlarged the food purchasing power of a million people in low income families by, on the average, more than a third; and we have launched a series of programs designed to help millions escape from poverty.

It is both unfair and unsound to deny the farmer an opportunity to get a fair return in the marketplace as do other segments of our economy. It is better to use the dollars we save through this program to provide the food which low income families need than to discriminate against the farmer in order to favor the consumer by 3.6 cents a week. This program enables us to act in the best interest of both the consumer and the farmer.

The feed grain program, which this year broke all records on participation and acreage placed in conserving uses, will be continued with important adjustments simplifying its administration. As this program continues to bring surplus stocks down by keeping production at reasonable levels, the position of graingrowers as well as livestock producers will be strengthened.

Since 1960 income to rice producers has climbed 44 percent from \$240 million to \$345 million and the cost of the rice program has increased 54 percent, climbing from \$117 million to \$180 million. The two-price certificate program recommended for rice will cut costs which are becoming prohibitive in the current program.

Through the use of graduated payments, a system long followed in the successful sugar program, the income for all rice producers would be increased and at the same time additional income for the smaller producer would be possible.

The bill also will extend the wool program, and will enable the small wool producer to earn a better income than he does now.

We are continuing to discuss with producers and other interested groups legislative proposals for cotton and dairy, and we are hopeful that widespread support can be found for proposals in both commodities.

Through the proposed authority to transfer and lease allotments, the part-time farmer who seeks to leave or the farmer who wishes to retire will get a fair return for his allotment while the smaller farmer who needs to expand to an adequate size family farm will be able to acquire the additional capacity he needs to efficiently use modern technology.

The cropland adjustment program will help the part-time farmer who wants to discontinue operations and the older farmer who wants to retire, and at the same time will help contain production and reduce the cost of the several commodity programs. Obviously it will be less expensive to keep land out of production on a long-term basis than to make the same adjustment year by year as we do now in the wheat and feed grain programs. Such a program will assist local communities to move cropland permanently into new conservation, recreation and beautification uses, thus enabling land resources to serve multiple purposes.

Both the cropland adjustment and the sale and lease of allotment features will be carefully supervised by the county ASCS committees to prevent abuses and any adverse effect on the local economy.

The proposals of the President are not a sliding-back or a no-gains program. These programs will provide higher income for the farmer. They will provide new opportunity for the farmer who wants to acquire the resources necessary for an adequate sized 20th century family farm, and they will give meaningful assistance to the farmer who wishes to retire or has the chance to earn a better living in another occupation.

And what are the alternatives?

Consider wheat, for example. This week—2 days from now in fact—I am required by law to proclaim marketing quotas on wheat. If no legislation were then forthcoming to arrest the inexorable march of events required by the old law, we would then have to hold a grower referendum by August 1.

If marketing quotas were not approved, price supports would be at 50 percent of parity or \$1.25 to wheatgrowers who produced within their allotments.

In the absence of feed grain legislation, price supports for corn in 1966 would be set between 50 and 90 percent of parity—at a level which avoids any increase in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This means that price support would have to be near the lower limit of the permitted range—in other words, near 50 percent of parity. A price support at 50 percent of parity—based on recent levels—would be around 78 cents a bushel.

Are there other realistic alternatives? Ask yourself whether a Congress willing to help the farmer but beset by competing and conflicting proposals which portray the absence of a broad consensus in agriculture will be able to take constructive action. You know the answer better than I do.

I am here today to urge you as responsible leaders of sectional and competing interests within farm organizations and commodity groups, and the sectional and competing interests within farm organizations and commodity groups, to give the farmer the united leadership he deserves and must have if he is to profit from the improved climate of understanding and support that has developed in recent years.

I speak plainly and even bluntly to you when I say that the extension and strengthening of the commodity program this year before they lapse is your responsibility. The President is concerned. The Secretary of Agriculture is concerned. We care deeply about the farmer and the Nation's well-being. And we have worked hard and consulted broadly to develop a sensible practical program that will increase income, cut Government costs, continue fair prices to the consumer, and help to ease the pain of adjustments that are taking place inexorably in agriculture. We have done about all we could do. The Congress waits now to hear from you. If you speak with a common voice that makes sense, I am confident the country and the Congress will respond in like manner. If you bicker between yourselves as farm organizations, and if subcommodity groups fight one another, each trying to get

more for their group at the expense of the others, then the urban American and those who represent him in the Congress will say "a plague on all your houses."

Together we have fought many battles on many fronts to improve farm programs and to move closer toward parity of income. We have won some battles, and we have lost some. But since 1960 we have made real progress. Net farm income nationally is \$1 billion more than in 1960. Net income per farm is \$681, 23 percent greater than it was in 1960. Grain surpluses have been sharply cut. Public understanding of agriculture's importance and problems is much improved.

At this moment and in this year, in a very real sense, we are at a fork of the road. One fork has a sign that reads "unity and cooperation." It means continued hard work but it promises us progress. The other fork has a sign that reads "I want mine my way." It leads to friction, confusion, frustration and before the year is out, chaos in American agriculture.

The choice is yours; the benefits, or the agony of that choice, belongs to all farmers and the Nation.

STATEMENT OF PROF. DAVID NELSON ROWE ON PRESIDENT'S JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY SPEECH

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the President's remarks at the Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965, constituted an important policy declaration in the field of foreign affairs. One of the most perceptive analyses of the President's remarks, that has come to my attention, is a statement by Prof. David Nelson Rowe of the department of political science at Yale University. I am inserting this statement in the RECORD.

Professor Rowe is one of the foremost authorities in the Nation on the Far East. Consequently, his observations on the President's address deserve the thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress:

STATEMENT OF PROF. DAVID NELSON ROWE, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, YALE UNIVERSITY

Most analyses of President Johnson's speech of April 7 have focused on the statement, "We remain ready for unconditional discussions." The commentators, for the most part, have emphasized the "unconditional" nature of discussions that might take place regarding a Vietnam settlement, without noting that the President carefully stated just prior in his speech, the conditions that had to be met before peace could come to Vietnam.

These conditions which the President stated in his speech were contained in the following passage:

"Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country.

"These are the essentials of any final settlement."

Logically, of course, if the government in North Vietnam were to agree to uncondi-

tional discussions on a settlement in South Vietnam, they would have to accept the preconditions laid down by President Johnson as stated above. In other words, the President would really seem to have stated in his speech the conditions of an unconditional discussion about peace in South Vietnam.

One is therefore justified in asking what, in this context, has genuine priority in administration thinking and planning about a settlement for South Vietnam, conditions or unconditional discussions? What does the President really mean? How can we know?

We do know this; namely, that the conditions the President laid down for a settlement in Vietnam have, in the past, been repeatedly rejected in specific terms, not only by Hanoi, but by the Chinese Communists and the Russians. Since the administration clearly knows this, is his tender of unconditional discussions in reality a thinly veiled offer to the Hanoi government that, if they will enter such discussions, the preconditions stated in the speech will be downgraded, de-emphasized, or even set aside?

In view of the clarity with which our objectives for South Vietnam have been stated in the past, it would not be surprising if the Hanoi government and its Communist backers in China and the U.S.S.R. concluded that any such setting aside of U.S. objectives for South Vietnam was clearly highly improbable. Along this line, the Chinese Communists have already described the speech as full of "lies," and we may expect more of the same, in their future reactions to it.

Perhaps another interpretation of the tender by the President of "unconditional discussions" is that discussions of a settlement can go on while the fighting still continues at the present level of intensity or at even higher levels of intensity. It is a fact, of course, that the U.S. level of participation in the fighting is steadily and materially rising, with notable increases in our military action in the area having taken place within some 36 hours of the delivery of the speech. At the same time, it seems probable that material increases in U.S. military manpower in combat operations in South Vietnam will be made very shortly.

To the Hanoi government this must mean simply that U.S. policy remains just what it was before the President's speech, namely, that we will employ any and all military means to secure victory in South Vietnam, and victory over North Vietnam if necessary to a South Vietnam settlement along our own lines, while at the same time we invite unconditional discussions.

The President's speech went a long way toward trying to avoid any such conclusion on the part of the Hanoi government, particularly in his open offer to that government that it accept a part of the profit to be secured from an offer of gigantic U.S. economic aid to southeast Asian countries. He thus implied that a victory for our policy in respect to South Vietnam did not necessarily imply the loss of North Vietnam's own independence at our hands. It must be noted that the development of the Mekong River for electrical power and irrigation, to which the President referred, is now in its preliminary stages, but that cooperation of southeast Asian countries in this work includes only Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and South Vietnam. North Vietnam is conspicuously absent from this cooperative enterprise, and the President's invitation to Hanoi to join in is not very likely to gain any more support in Hanoi than his invitation in his speech to the U.S.S.R. to cooperate actively in this U.N. enterprise.

It is quite clear that Communist policy toward the Mekong River development is to stand aside, allow the free world and its allies to support the Mekong River project, and, in the meantime, to destroy the independence of all southeast Asian countries

and subvert their governments by Communist takeover. This will, in their thinking, effectively secure for Communist regimes in southeast Asia, the future fruits of all such free world investment in this gigantic project as develop prior to Communist takeover of all southeast Asia. For them to think otherwise, and to join in with U.N. sponsored and free world financed development plans in southeast Asia, would, to them, be nothing less than suspension of the cold war and a contradiction of their hopes for victory over us in the hot war now underway in Vietnam.

Thus President Johnson seems to have given in to the hope that through a combination of economic inducements and military pressures, the current Communist program for the takeover of southeast Asia may be abandoned. No one can blame him for using economic inducements if he can, but, in the light of past history, can the administration really believe that anything but military action can stop Communist aggression? In fact, the President himself, in his speech, says: "The central lesson of our time is that the appetite for aggression is never satisfied. To withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next. We must say in southeast Asia—as we did in Europe—in the words of the Bible: 'Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further.'"

There is, however, a totally dismaying parallelism in the so-called carrot motif in the President's speech, with the pre-World War II arguments of the appeasers, namely, that if we could only change Hitler's Germany from a have-not country into a have country (at the expense of other countries, of course), that German aggression would no longer be necessary, and being unnecessary, aggression would be abandoned. This argument, of the isolationists, appeasers and self-styled liberals of that day, has been proved, over and over again, to be as wrong in respect to Hitler's Germany, as it always has been in respect to the Communist aggressors of our own day. Yet it is constantly being preached both at home and abroad, in simplistic primitive-Marxist terms, that economic uplift is the key to alleviating and eliminating all human troubles, conflicts, and difficulties. The President, who seems to quote the Bible with such facility, should recall the Biblical adjuration to the effect that "man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that issues from the mouth of God." This would seem to mean, at the minimum, that the limits of economic cooperation and mutuality lie at the boundaries of total disagreement about basic ideologies and values.

Here, again, the President's speech displays an utterly dismaying characteristic. I refer to his seemingly careful avoidance of any identification of the North Vietnamese regime as Communist, or of its own aggression against South Vietnam as a North Vietnamese Communist aggression.

In his entire speech, in fact, he uses the word "Communist" only once, in reference to Communist China. The paragraph in which this reference takes place is an important one. It identifies Communist China as the backer of Hanoi, and states that "the contest in Vietnam is part of a wider pattern of aggressive purpose." But nowhere in the speech is Hanoi identified as Communist. One can only wonder at the possible purpose of this obvious attempt to disidentify communism from the Hanoi government and its aggression in the South. Is the President trying to adopt the old and now utterly discredited tactic of trying to "wean away" one Communist government from its Communist backer? Is this the political parallel in the speech, of the carrot motif in economics, i.e., let's all have peace and we will help you have prosperity and full bellies, too? That is to say, when we invite Hanoi and the U.S.S.R. both to join the Mekong River proj-

ect, and refrain from inviting Communist China to do so, are we saying in effect, Moscow is a "good Communist," China is a bad one; you should join up with Moscow against Peiping?

Such a line is wholly understandable when coming from those who accept at its crude face value the Moscow line of coexistence and who attribute to the Chinese Communists a genuine departure from this line and an aggressive militancy toward the free world both qualitatively and quantitatively different from that of the U.S.S.R. But why does the President seem to feel that Hanoi's aggression in the South is backed any less by Moscow than by Peiping? Surely all the evidence is to the contrary. The efforts to make a distinction in this respect are invidious in the extreme. Moscow's longstanding doctrinal and material support to wars of liberation everywhere is surely well known.

Whatever may be the basis for the President's avoidance in this speech, of any Communist identification of labeling of Hanoi and its aggression in the South, there is no doubt that this avoidance embodies a genuine contrast with past official statements by both the President and the State Department. For example, the State Department publication of December 1961 (No. 7308) and titled "A Threat to the Peace—North Vietnam's Effort To Conquer South Vietnam" fully and explicitly identifies North Vietnam and its aggression in the South with communism. By contrast with President Johnson's speech of April 7, 1965, this State Department publication uses the terms "Communist" or "communism" five times on its first page in referring to the war of the North against the South in Vietnam. And it identifies the Vietcong operating in the South as "Vietnamese Communist," and uses the term "Vietcong" on that same first page three times.

In the State Department white paper of February 27, 1965, entitled "Aggression From the North—The Record of North Vietnam's Campaign To Conquer South Vietnam," as printed in the New York Times on February 28, 1965, the first half-column of newsprint contains six uses of the term "Communist," referring clearly to the "Communist regime in Hanoi," the "Communist program of conquest directed against South Vietnam," etc.

Finally, as recently as March 25, 1965, President Johnson himself called for an end to "Communist aggression" in Vietnam, and accused the "Communists" of being unwilling to enter into any reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security "of all in southeast Asia."

Thus his avoidance of any such reference to the Hanoi regime and its aggression in South Vietnam in his speech of April 7, 1965, takes on an added significance. It could not be accidental; it must have been planned carefully. It seems to be part and parcel of a definite change in emphasis in our policy toward southeast Asia in general. Under such a policy are we going to differentiate so strongly and definitely between good Communists and bad Communists that, in the end, we may persuade ourselves that there are some good Communists even in South Vietnam, and that it is to our interest to discover and treat with them by way of stabilizing the political situation there? Is this what the President's new policy of unconditional discussions really will come to mean in the end? If so, it can be predicted that the President will fail to disabuse us of the truth, namely, that "Communist" and "aggressor" are synonymous terms.

The same avoidance of the identification of the Hanoi regime as Communist characterizes the reply of President Johnson on April 8, 1965, to the 17th so-called nonaligned nations which had urged quick negotiations on Vietnam. This is a much briefer document than his speech of the previous day, and it includes much wording taken directly

from that speech. In it, after listing a number of specific components of North Vietnam's aggression in the South, the President states: "When these things stop and the obstacles to security and stability are removed, the need for American supporting military action will also come to an end."

This clearly refers to American military action against North Vietnam as currently being carried on, for later on in the statement he promises the withdrawal of our forces from the South only after "conditions have been created in which the people of South Vietnam can determine their own future free from external interference."

The reply to the so-called nonaligned nations repeats the proviso for peace in Vietnam made in the speech of April 7 and quoted on the first page of this memorandum, above. At this point it will be well, in view of all that we have said, to point sharply at one component of the President's prescription for peace in Vietnam; namely, that Vietnam should "be tied to no alliance."

Does the President thus prescribe a non-aligned South Vietnam or a neutral South Vietnam? If so, would he dictate this condition for South Vietnam both to the aggressors in Hanoi and to the people of South Vietnam as well? What if the people in South Vietnam resist any such proviso? Would we then be prepared, as in the case of former President Diem himself, to connive at the removal from power there of any elements that resisted our view? If so, is this our understanding of self-determination and independence for South Vietnam, to which President Johnson so strongly subscribes?

In fact, of course, neutralization for South Vietnam, as with Laos previously, would almost certainly end in steady, if slow, Communist takeover. The President actually implies then when he specifies for South Vietnam the necessity of having new ways and means of assurance that aggression has in fact been stopped. But he understandably avoids any stipulation in either his speech or his statement to the 17 nations as to just what these new ways and means could be apart from continued deep and pervasive U.S. involvement in South Vietnam, together with a firm commitment to that government, after pacification, that U.S. force would be quickly available to stop further aggression in that country from any source whatever and of whatever sort. This is the essential which has been lacking in respect to Laos, with thus far disastrous results for that country.

In this connection, the reactions from abroad to the President's speech are of great interest. Among these is the reaction of Tran Van Huu, former Premier of South Vietnam and an active advocate of neutralization for his country. He described the President's speech as comforting and specifically interpreted it as advocating the idea of neutralization.

Surely what has recently happened to India demonstrates that in the face of Communist aggression the only neutrality that is possible is one which is tied to defense arrangements with the West which will help provide the sanctions necessary to prevent that aggression. This is the posture which India, after much suffering at the hands of the Communists, and much soul searching, has finally come to adopt. But is this neutral? And can it be based upon the President's prescription that such a country "be tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country"? The President, and all of us, will have to face up to the reality that in this world where Communist aggression endangers everyone, genuine neutrality is an impossible dream. In the world today, the only people that can genuinely mind only their own business are those who combine with others of like mind to do so and to protect their right and opportunity so to do.

Cambodia is another case in point, and in southeast Asia. Can anyone deny that Cambodia's heretofore rather dubious neutralism has become a much more positive thing vis-a-vis both Hanoi and Peking since the Americans started bombing North Vietnam?

Seen in this light, the President's simultaneous talk of neutralization for South Vietnam and the continuance of strong military sanctions against North Vietnam, can at the best merely confuse our friends and allies in southeast Asia and elsewhere. At worst, it can convince them all that we are preparing another Laos-type surrender in the shape of coalition government including in the future those native to either North or South Vietnam and whom we now no longer term "Communists."

Finally, should we perhaps conclude simply that the recent statements by and from the President are merely political? Are they meant only to offer something for everyone? In view of their inherent contradictoriness, this is a tempting view. But if they are merely political it would seem that they are so for both domestic and foreign consumption. British Empire reaction, with the possible exception of Australia, seems uniformly approving. The French think the speech did not go far enough, that the President should have openly stated the possibility that all Vietnam must eventually be united under Hanoi with a government either Communist or neutralist. But of course they are forgetting that such overtiness on the part of the President could hardly escape arousing an intensely hostile reaction among the majority of the American people and their Congress. It is hard to escape the conclusion that after the President's latest efforts to justify the policy of his administration have been studied and digested by the American people, they will be even more doubtful as to the real and ultimate purposes and intents of that policy than they ever have been before. And if finally our military actions in Vietnam purchase nothing but another negotiated sellout of Vietnam as was the case with Laos without such military action on our part, the defeat of our Nation will thus be all the greater.

THE ELECTION RESEARCH COUNCIL, INC., REPORT

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the issue of fraud at the ballot box is of continuing concern to all Americans. In recent correspondence with Republican National Committeeman Winthrop Rockefeller of Arkansas, my attention was called to a report compiled by the Election Research Council, Inc., which dealt with alleged irregularities in last November's elections in the State of Arkansas.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the Record my correspondence with Mr. Rockefeller and the text of the report compiled by the Election Research Council, Inc.

The correspondence and material referred to follow:

MARCH 17, 1965.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: Republicans in Arkansas are deeply concerned that discus-

sion of proposed legislation regarding voting rights has not touched on one of our major problems—protection of votes once they are cast.

Assuring the right to vote is not enough when coercion is used to influence the outcome of elections or if the votes are improperly counted.

Certainly, voting rights must be guaranteed, but rights should not end with the privilege of registering or even casting a ballot.

Additional safeguards are indicated, and I urge that you make every effort to see that such protection is given consideration before any new legislation is enacted.

Currently, when local authorities choose to frustrate citizens' attempts to assure themselves of honest elections, there is very little if any effective recourse to Federal authority, even though Federal elections may be involved.

In the near future, we will send documentation to illustrate that of which we speak.

Sincerely,

WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER.

MARCH 18, 1965.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: As I promised in my letter of March 17, I enclose a copy of the Election Research Council, Inc., preliminary report on absentee voting in the Arkansas 1964 general election.

I believe this nonpartisan study clearly illustrates why more consideration must be given to protecting votes once they are cast.

Please give your closest attention to incorporation of safeguards for the votes of all our citizens into any new legislation.

Sincerely,

WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER.

APRIL 9, 1965.

MR. WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Tower Building, Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR WIN: I am very grateful for your recent letter calling attention to the importance of guarding against fraudulent voting in legislation protecting the right to vote. The casting and counting of fraudulent ballots means a dilution of the vote of honest men and is tantamount to a deprivation of their right to vote.

The report of the Election Research Council is an important document. I plan to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD next week. I am also calling to the attention of Republican members of the Judiciary Committee and of our task force on voting rights your correspondence and report.

If we need fuller information about the situation in Arkansas, I shall ask Bill Prendergast to get in touch with you about it. One item that would be helpful would be newspaper clippings dealing with voting irregularities. I notice the report that you sent referred to articles that have appeared in the Pine Bluff Commercial. Copies of these and other news stories and editorial comment would be very helpful in focusing attention on the evil which should be corrected.

It might interest you to know that the report of the joint congressional committee on Republican principles, which I headed in 1962, had the following to say about voting fraud: "The right to vote is denied by fraud in the casting or counting of ballots as surely as by exclusion from the polls. Republicans urge vigorous investigation of fraud at the polls and recommend corrective action."

Very best regards and good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

THE ELECTION RESEARCH COUNCIL, INC., REPORT, FEBRUARY 21, 1965

The first postelection report of the Election Research Council summarizes activities and findings of the council from November 3, 1964 to date. It does not purport to be a comprehensive summary of election irregularities occurring in the November election. To compile such a summary would require the full time and effort of scores of people over many months.

Rather than cover the entire field, the council has attempted to concentrate its efforts in the area of absentee voting. The reason for this is apparent. Until the requirement was imposed by amendment 51 that voters must register in person, the absentee ballot boxes were subject to manipulation almost at will.

For example, anyone could purchase poll tax receipts for an assortment of gravestones, and then apply by mail for absentee ballots. The county clerk, seeing that the applicants were listed in the poll book, would then send the ballots and voters' statements to the designated address. The ballots would be returned and counted.

It is generally agreed that there was more purging of absentee ballots this general election than ever before. This was due in part to the intense heat generated by the presidential and gubernatorial races and the controversial nature of some of the amendments on the ballot. Local option and other local issues also played an important part in many areas. Despite this widespread casting out of ballots, our preliminary studies indicate that the total of 30,930 ballots actually counted was bloated with fraudulent and invalid votes.

As previously indicated, our studies are incomplete at this time and we are therefore unable to specify exactly how many of these votes were fraudulent or otherwise invalid. If the ratio established thus far continues, it is probable that well over half of the 30,930 absentee votes are invalid. It is well to point out that this estimate does not take into consideration those voters who were not qualified voters either because of residency or other reasons. Neither does it take into consideration those applications with doubtful reasons for voting absentee listed.

A superficial leafing through applications and voter statements gives firm purchase to the proposition that residency and reason-for-absence requirements were not enforced. If these factors were considered, it is doubtful that there were 10,000 valid absentee votes cast in the general election of 1964.

Now that registration of each voter in person is required under Arkansas constitutional amendment 51, the problem of non-resident voters will be minimized. But, as the following report reflects, many of the abuses occurring in absentee voting could have been avoided if county clerks were more conversant with the absentee voting laws and with their duties in connection with it. For example, if an invalid application is received into the office of a county clerk, that clerk does a disservice to the voter by issuing him a ballot and voter's statement. Without an application in legal form, the ballot should not and may not be counted. Properly, the clerk should refuse all illegal applications and request the voter to make new application in legal form.

An additional problem encountered by the council was the inaccessibility of some records. Many fraudulent votes were no doubt cast and counted in the absentee boxes because some county clerks refused to allow public inspection of the absentee applications in advance of election day. This was certainly the case in Jefferson County, and we speculate that this would have been the case in Madison County to a greater extent than the few affidavits in our files reflect.

In many counties, we found conscientious county clerks who welcomed inspection of the records and who had a broad knowledge of our absentee voting laws. In those counties, in nearly all instances the absentee voting laws were followed to the letter with the result that illegal votes in those boxes were kept to a level below 10 percent. To name just a few, we were particularly impressed with the offices of the county clerks in Mississippi, Lonoke, Izard, Calhoun, Drew, and Lawrence Counties.

Although our investigation of the November election is by no means complete, we present some of our findings to date:

A. NURSING HOMES

The absentee boxes were utilized by many nursing homes in the State as a means of bloc voting in the November election. Of course, this is not a novel procedure. Following the Democratic primary, for instance, the GPW Negro nursing home administrator, Newport, Jackson County, was charged with commission of a felony after he purportedly forged the absentee applications of 44 patients, one of whom had been dead for some months.

But this November the political activity in nursing homes hit a new high. The reason can be found in a letter written by Charles A. Stewart, executive secretary of the Arkansas Nursing Home Association, to its constituent members. That letter is as follows:

(First, a memorandum to Governor Faubus concerning legislative proposals is set forth.)

"You will notice from the above memorandum that a great deal of work has been done toward the three State classification of nursing homes. We feel very sure that with your help and 100 percent effort from all the nursing homes in the State of Arkansas, that we can put this plan into effect in full in early 1965. To do this we still must do several things. We must have the complete cooperation of as many State senators and representatives as possible and this is where you come in. We may and we will ask you to do some things which will require some work and a little money, but we cannot stress strongly enough that this is a must. We must have your help. One of the first things that must be done is that we need your help in securing a poll tax for each of your nursing home patients who do not have a new poll tax receipt and a poll tax receipt for each of your employees. It will be necessary for you to contact each employee and each patient to see if they have a new poll tax receipt which will be good for the November election. These may be bought until September 31 of this year.

"After making this survey of your own nursing home or nursing homes then we ask you to go to your county courthouse and secure poll taxes for every patient and every employee who does not have one. After doing this it is most important that we have, in this office, a list of these patients and employees with their poll tax numbers. There are about 7,000 nursing home patients in Arkansas at this time and an estimated 5,000 employees, you can see how effective, politically, that a stack of these listings with poll tax numbers will be to us. This is an effort that requires the help of every nursing home in the State. Cooperation by half of the nursing homes simply will not get this job done.

"Again let us say that this is the most ambitious program that the nursing homes in Arkansas or any other State have ever undertaken. We have plans to change the entire regulations of both the health department and the welfare department and effect a complete new pay scale which will more equitably reimburse you for the care you are now giving your patients.

"We are most sensitive to the fact that the present rate of payment of \$105 by the wel-

fare department is woefully inadequate to care for those intermediate and skilled care patients who need care the most. The responsibility of caring for these patients is shared jointly by the State welfare department and the owners and administrators of the private nursing homes in Arkansas. We strongly believe in the future of proprietary type nursing homes. We want to make them stronger, and better, but at the same time that responsibility shared with us by the State welfare department must of necessity be truly shared in equitable reimbursement.

"This brings us to the summary in our memorandum to the Governor. Even though this new program will probably go into effect in early 1965, you need help now. The small raise we have asked for is dictated by the small amount of funds available to the welfare department for the balance of this year. We cannot assure you now that our request will be granted; we can assure you we are doing our best.

"Sincerely yours,

"CHARLES A. STEWART,

"Executive Secretary."

The Pine Bluff Commercial, some 2 months ago, carried an article on voting practices at the Kilgore Nursing Home in Jefferson County. The newspaper pointed out that at least three of the Kilgore home voters were also on the list of persons who had been committed to the State hospital for the mentally ill. Two of the names of voting patients corresponded with the names of persons adjudged mentally incompetent in Jefferson County.

The Commercial interviewed one patient at the Kilgore home who stated that he couldn't say whether he voted or not, but that if he had, he didn't know for whom he voted.

The Commercial also determined that the home maintains a "political" folder, containing all of the poll tax receipts for the patients. The home paid for some 60 of the poll taxes. The administrator of the home, Mick Vaskov, stated that political materials had been received from the Nursing Home Association, including a brochure favoring amendment 55 (legalized gambling).

The council submitted the applications for poll tax receipts, the applications for absentee ballots, and the voters' statements accompanying the ballots for some sixty of the patients in the home to its handwriting analyst, who detected a number of forged signatures, and in fact stated that in his opinion many of the "x" marks of patients who presumably could not write were forged, 18 by one person and 13 by another. The analyst has formed an opinion as to the identity of the person making the 18 marks.

In absentee box number four, where the Kilgore patients were voted, only about 126 votes were cast. That box markedly deviated from the Jefferson County averages, being overwhelmingly in favor of Governor Faubus, and amendment 55 (legalized gambling), and overwhelmingly against amendment 54 (voter registration).

Other Kilgore nursing homes are located in Dallas County, where seventy patients voted absentee. Strenuous objections were raised to counting many of these votes where the patients had been transferred from the State Hospital for Nervous Diseases in Benton to the homes, but the votes were nonetheless counted.

The election officials of the absentee box in Saline County disqualified all the absentee ballots cast by or for patients at the Doyle Shelnutt nursing home in Benton during the November election, because all applications had been delivered to the county clerk by the Shelnutts personally, and this is not legally acceptable.

Previously, the Shelnutts had carried many of the patients to a polling place to vote in the Democratic primary. But this time, all

were voted absentee. One lady, whose grandmother was in the home, objected to the purchase of her grandmother's poll tax receipt by any third party, and also objected to her grandmother's vote being cast in any election. Immediately following the election, she and her family were requested by Mrs. Shelnutt to remove her grandmother from the home.

Affidavits on file in the council office quote Mrs. Shelnutt as stating that she purchased poll tax receipts for many of the patients. Of course, this was contrary to our election laws.

The Pioneer Nursing Home in Melbourne, Izard County, with Mrs. Boyce Cook as administrator, was also politically active. Analysis of the handwriting of the 49 applications for absentee ballots reveals, in the opinion of the analyst, that 47 of these signatures were forged by the same person, and two others were authored by still another person. Scrutiny of the signatures on the voter statements showed that 34 of these signatures were forged by the same person forging 47 of the signatures on the applications. The handwriting analyst has formed an opinion as to the identity of the person forging these many signatures.

Interestingly enough, the forger made no effort to conceal the similarities in handwriting on the applications, but did attempt to cover up the forgeries on the voters statements by simulating the shaky, erratic handwriting of the very old and the infirm.

Similarly, handwriting analysis revealed forgeries in the applications for absentee ballots and the voter statements from patients in the Twin Lakes Nursing Home at Mountain Home, in Baxter County. The expert's opinion is that 11 of the applications and 12 of the voter statements were signed by the same person, and that still another person executed the signatures on 6 applications and 6 voter statements. Here again, the forger attempted to disguise and vary his handwriting.

Boland Nursing in Howard County also produced some forged voter statements and applications. The handwriting analysis showed at least seven discrepancies in marks and signatures on the documents, and further showed that whoever filled out all the applications also signed signatures to at least two of the applications and two of the voter statements.

The Mitchell Nursing Home in Danville, Yell County, had a number of patients voting absentee. Of these, in three cases the signatures on the applications did not correspond with the signatures on the voter statements. And the signatures on five of the applications and corresponding voter statements were all made by the same person, in the opinion of our handwriting analyst.

The foregoing is not intended to be a complete listing. Many other instances are under investigation. Some instances cannot be investigated. For example, in Crawford County the applications for absentee ballots from patients in a nursing home there are not in the files of the county clerk.

We do not imply that any of the patients in any of the nursing homes are abused or receive anything other than the best of care. But it is apparent that after the urging of Mr. Stewart, many administrators of nursing homes found it their duty to "get out the vote," even as to senile or disoriented patients. An interesting footnote is that the 1965 Arkansas General Assembly has enacted the legislation sought by Mr. Stewart.

B. OTHER FORGERIES

In addition to the forgeries detected that stemmed from nursing homes, the handwriting analyst has discovered hundreds of other examples.

Taking the worst for illustration, in Phillips County there were 835 names on the absentee voters' list. Of these, 209 names

were either illegible or not in the poll books. Of the remainder, 223 were white and 403 were Negro.

The Phillips County clerk, Warfield Gist, had on file only 301 applications. He stated that the remaining 534 persons were allowed to vote absentee without applications. Of course, these votes should not have been counted. In addition, there were only 744 voters statements, 91 less than the total number of absentee votes counted.

Taking the first 500 names on the absentee voters' list, 326 are Negroes, of whom 195 reside in the fourth ward of Helena. This number represents over 20 percent of the total number of Negro voters listed in the poll book for that precinct.

We were curious about the cause of this remarkably heavy absentee vote, and interviews with local Negroes disclosed that Jack and Amanda Bryant, Negro proprietors of the Dream Girls Beauty Shop in Helena, were extremely active in the solicitation of absentee votes in this ward.

Our handwriting analyst informs us that in his opinion more than 100 of the voter statements from the Helena fourth ward bear signatures forged by the same person. The identity of the forger has been determined, and the information is being forwarded to the proper authorities.

Ward 4, Helena, was not the only Phillips County area in which absentee voting fraud occurred. Our handwriting expert found other groups of statements which were signed by common authors, but as yet these persons signing the names of others have not been identified.

One indication that these fraudulent ballots may have been voted almost as a bloc is the lopsided results in the most controversial issues: Amendment 54 (voter registration) received 169 votes for and 528 votes against. Amendment 55 (gambling legalized) received 599 votes for with 96 votes against.

A great many other instances of suspected falsification of signatures on absentee applications and voter statements from other counties are being studied and examined for a report at a later date.

We should observe at this juncture that some counties with a previous history of questionable absentee voting practices were exemplary in the November election. For instance, in the Democratic primary in Desha County there reportedly were more than 100 forgeries on absentee ballot requests in an unusually heavy absentee vote. This was brought to the attention of the public officials and citizens as a result of an election contest.

In the general election in Desha County, no forgeries were detected. Only 4.3 percent voted absentee, irregularities seemed to be at a minimum, and the absentee vote outcome was substantially similar to the total vote of the county, indicating that no faction exploited the box. The county clerk did an excellent job of attending to the absentee applications.

This is an example of the improvement that can be made in the conduct of elections when improper practices are brought to the attention of public officials.

C. NONRESIDENT VOTERS

Under our previous system of no voter registration whatever, quite a number of voters would cast their ballot in their county of residence, while at the same time continue to vote through absentee procedures in another county.

Of course, a few individuals in the State exerted some extra effort and voted in person in more than one county. Probably the worst performance in recent years in non-resident voting fraud was turned in by the resident of a county in the Arkansas River Valley who, while traveling through the northwest portion of the State on election

day, cast his vote personally in at least four counties. This is not an isolated instance, but it is certainly the most outstanding one. Prior to the passage of the voter registration amendment, there existed no effective system of controls to prevent voters from voting on both sides of a county line if poll taxes were purchased in both counties.

Former residents vote

Then there is another category of migratory voter. In this classification fall former residents of counties who continue to hold poll taxes in those counties and who continue to vote in those counties, not realizing that this is taking place. In illustration, a spot check of the absentee voters in Poinsett County produced affidavits from six or eight nonresidents who stated that they did not purchase a poll tax for Poinsett County; that they did not have the poll tax receipts in their possession; that they authorized no one to purchase their poll tax for them; and that they had not made application for absentee ballot. Nevertheless, the names of these persons are shown in the Poinsett County pollbook; and applications, obviously forged, for absentee ballots were mailed in. Some of these fraudulent applications were among the more than 175 applications received by the Poinsett County clerk from box 256, Trumann. Apparently this box number was used by some political group as a means of colonizing voters.

Madison County highest

Based on some fact and considerable speculation, we would place Madison County high on the list of areas infiltrated by nonresident voters.

Inasmuch as the Madison County voting records, previously inaccessible, disappeared on January 13, a complete study of election frauds there will be impossible.

The highest percentage of absentee voting in the State is an indication that the absentee box in Madison County was manipulated for political purposes. More than 1 of every 10 votes cast in Madison County was cast in the absentee box. This "packing" of the absentee box resulted in a remarkable departure from the county averages. For example, in the Governor's race, Faubus received 64 percent of the total Madison County votes. But he received 91 percent of the votes cast in the absentee box. The discrepancy on the other issues and races were considerably less dramatic than this, except as to proposed amendment 55, which received a favorable vote on 56 percent of the votes cast in the absentee box, but only 41 percent of the countywide votes.

Affidavits on file

The affidavits and tape recordings on file now with the council reflect that political workers in Madison County went into the surrounding counties persuading residents of those counties to vote in the Madison County absentee box. How many fraudulent votes were cast in this fashion may never be determined, but the fact remains that it did happen. Now the persons who cast those fraudulent votes in the Madison County absentee box cannot be brought to justice for the crimes committed due to the stubborn refusal of the county clerk, Charles Whorton, to permit examination of the voting records prior to their theft.

Migratory voter problem

The migratory voter problem was also present in Perry County. Although the percentage of clearly invalid applications is relatively low when compared with other counties, many of the applications have been filled out by the same person and mailed to persons outside the county and State for their signatures. In such cases, there is an indiscriminate use of the term "work" as a cause for being absent. Nine and one-half percent of the total vote of Perry County

(which exceeded the number of eligible voters as shown by the last census) was cast in the absentee box. We have contacted several longtime residents of Perry County and have gone over the list of absentee voters with them. A large number of these absentee voters are unknown to the Perry County residents of the wards in which the voters are supposed to reside.

As our studies are still incomplete on Perry County, we can offer no statistics at this time.

Conway County, the perennial home of the out-of-State voter, once again opened its absentee box to the applications and votes of many persons who have not lived in Conway County for many years. Indeed, some of the votes cast were by persons who have not entered the State of Arkansas in recent years. Other than the problem of adulterating the Conway County vote with the votes of nonresidents, no other unusual problems were encountered, although this county's results are still being studied.

In all counties where nonresident voting has become a problem, there were few if any controls over the purchase of poll tax receipts. In fact, in some counties poll tax receipts were purchased in large blocks by politically active personages for individuals who would not otherwise have paid a dollar for the privilege of voting.

Irregularities and Noncompliance With Laws

Many thousands of illegal votes were cast in the November election simply through failure of the voters or the county clerk to conform with the laws. The most extreme example is that of Pike County. The voter list shows that 190 absentee votes were cast and counted. Nevertheless, only 135 applications were on record, of which 127 were clearly invalid on their face. Some applications were not on the prescribed form, some were not signed by the voter, some gave no reason whatever for being absent from their precinct, and some were no more than notations on a scratch pad. This left only 8 possible valid votes of the total of 190.

But apparently there were no voters' statements submitted with the ballots, none being on file. This means that Pike County, if in fact the voter statements were not presented, had no valid absentee votes. A majority of the absentee applications examined from Pike County were written on commercial pads from the clerk's office, and were filled out by only one or two persons. At present, these applications are in the hands of a handwriting expert to examine in particular those applications which appear to the untrained eye to be signed by the same person.

In Polk County, failure to strictly comply with the law resulted in the invalidity of about one-third of the 459 ballots cast. In many of these instances, the applications were not signed by the elector. Other applications were simply in letter or memorandum form and not in compliance with our election laws. Other applications gave no reason or an inadequate reason for voting absentee.

Of the 254 absentee ballot applications examined in Monroe County, 87 were invalid on their face, all for failure to meet the requirements of the law. On some applications, persons other than the applicant signed. On others, the requests were made by letter or on notes rather than on the prescribed form. And in others, no reason or an insufficient reason was given for being absent.

Of the 246 applications examined from Cleburne County, there were 156 invalid on their face. Not all of these 156 persons applying voted, 124 actually casting ballots. The problem in this county is that most of the applications were made by letter.

The council previously observed, in news releases prior to the November election, that hundreds of applications for absentee ballots

in Garland County were illegal for much the same reason as those listed above for the other counties. One difference, however, is that in Garland County error was invited by furnishing prospective absentee voters with a form of application which permits it to be signed by one other than the voter. Of course, votes cast upon such an application would be illegal and void.

A high percentage of invalid applications was also noted in Woodruff County, where of 153 votes counted, 65 were illegal because of invalid applications.

The problem of sloppy procedures in administration of absentee voting was graphically illustrated in Logan County, where an election contest for the office of county judge was recently concluded.

In Logan County, 375 absentee votes were cast and counted. Of this total, 147 were declared illegal during the course of the trial of the election contest. These votes amount to some 39 percent of the total absentee vote, and the illegalities were primarily the result of failure of the applicant to make application on the prescribed form or failure of the applicant to sign the application. As to those applications received in time, the county clerk could and should have returned the illegal applications to the applicant advising the voter to submit another application in proper form. Had this simple procedure been followed, those voters would not have been disenfranchised and their votes could have been counted in that very close election contest.

E. CONCLUSION

The foregoing findings, as we have observed, should not be considered a comprehensive review of all fraud involved in the November election. Even the limited areas studied by the council have not been completely explored.

The council files are replete with evidence of voting frauds occurring at the polls, but not so easily categorized as the studies we have chosen to present in this initial report. But as we have stated, our files are open for inspection by anyone as to any of our areas of inquiry.

We would like to acknowledge our appreciation to the civic groups, volunteers, county clerks, county election commissioners, and Democratic and Republican Party officials without whose assistance we could not have conducted this study.

We hope that something good may come of our study. With necessary revisions in our voting laws, greater appreciation of the election process on the part of the people, and willingness of Arkansas citizens to perform their public duty from time to time by serving as election judges and clerks.

Our election process, at best, is rather inefficient, but it marks the difference between our democratic society and totalitarian systems. The voice of the people can best be heard through the ballot, and we should never condone or close our eyes to any condition which would pollute or adulterate the integrity of the vote in any election on any candidate or issue.

URBAN RENEWAL: THE NEW HAVEN EXPERIENCE

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on the day that our Federal income taxes fall due, it is worth noting an urban renewal

program that appears to be, after some uncertain starts, a good example of a profitable use of taxpayers funds. I am speaking of the urban renewal program in New Haven, Conn., as outlined in a New York Times article of April 11, 1965. The article was written by William Lee Miller, associate professor of social ethics at Yale, and L. Thomas Appleby, former development administrator of New Haven's urban renewal program.

As a commentary on the urban renewal program in general, it is interesting to note that the authors felt compelled to deny that, in New Haven at least, "urban renewal means Negro removal". From the facts given us in the article, there is apparently a great improvement within the past 2 years since the August 1963 Report of the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, which sharply criticized the results of dislocation in Connecticut urban renewal projects, including New Haven's.

Nor were New Haven's projects always as successful in appearance as now. There was a period of time, a few years ago, when a good deal of difficulty was encountered in locating developers, particularly in the downtown projects. Small businessmen were displaced to an out-of-the-way triangle area. The first apartment house for luxury apartments, University Towers, had a high vacancy rate at first, and a good deal of vacant land was quite apparent around the square. The first rehabilitation, in somewhat of the style of the Georgetown section of Washington, D.C., was for Georgetown type incomes.

New Haven's urban renewal program has taken a new turn, however, as construction continues unabated, and the needs of all income levels are being given ever-increasing consideration. In fact, it is this concern for the people involved in the process, rather than simply for buildings and plans, that sets New Haven apart as an example for other cities and towns to follow.

Mr. Appleby has recently been named director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and his record in New Haven holds out great promise for our Nation's Capital. He will find that in the Southwest project at least, urban renewal has meant Negro removal. Of the 23,000 low- and middle-income people living in the area prior to clearance, 76 percent were Negro. Today, after the expenditure of nearly \$100 million it is, according to the Washington Post, 90 percent white. Judging from the General Accounting Office criticisms of relocation in Washington, which found relocation into substandard dwellings and the use of a different criteria for judging a building standard for relocation than for clearance, there is a great deal that the Redevelopment Land Agency can learn from Mr. Appleby.

I would hope, however, that Mr. Appleby would modify his positions with respect to clearance and rehabilitation. He holds, in this article, that the only way to go about urban renewal in our cities is by clearance; "by knocking down the worst slums and starting over." In some cases this may be true, but Congress in

the 1964 Housing Act, in adopting amendments that I offered, made clear that clearance was a last resort, not the first priority.

Mr. Appleby also seems certain that since 1954 rehabilitation has been successful. In fact, as Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton told Action, Inc., last fall, the Federal Government has simply been "not equipped" to deal with rehabilitation, however many plans they may have given that label.

The chairman of Action's Rehabilitation Committee, Seth Taft, of Cleveland, recently told the membership at a Washington, D.C., meeting, that he did not "know of any city in the country where you can say there has been a successful rehabilitation program."

It is obvious that despite the success in New Haven, the urban renewal program cannot afford to rest on its laurels. There is a need for people, within the program, who are concerned for the people affected by the program. Old approaches must be reexamined, mistakes admitted, and corrected, problems anticipated and avoided or met through administrative and legislative action. The article on New Haven's program provides us with an opportunity to learn and move forward in other areas.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Apr. 11, 1965]

"YOU SHOVE OUT THE POOR TO MAKE HOUSES FOR THE RICH"

(By William Lee Miller and L. Thomas Appleby)

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—A faculty member of Amherst, visiting Yale recently, looked around at the very impressive rebuilding of the center of New Haven and, after the manner of professors, was not impressed.

"Where are the Negroes who used to live here?" he asked. "They push the poor people out and put up these luxury apartments and fancy stores and office buildings. Urban renewal means Negro removal."

This is one of the more pungent criticisms of urban renewal expressed nowadays by liberals, reflecting their disenchantment with a tool for social reform which they themselves sponsored. It is criticism that hurts, because the welfare of hundreds of thousands of slum dwellers—not to mention the future of our cities—depends on continued public support for the renewal program. These allegations must, therefore, be refuted as they arise, and fortunately the city of New Haven, Conn., can supply most of the evidence to do so. (There are also criticisms from the right, of course, about Government interference with freedom and subsidies for uneconomic uses of land; but civic-minded people have long ago agreed that a great many human needs are not going to be served at all by a free market left entirely to itself.)

The urban renewal program came into being as title I of the Housing Act of 1949. The idea was that the Federal Government would pay two-thirds of the cost (prohibitive for any private agency or for government at a lower level) of buying, clearing and reselling slum land.

This meant a greater use by local governments of "eminent domain." Whereas before they had taken private properties for public use (a highway or a school), now they could take private properties for a public purpose—to eliminate slums and urban blight. The Federal Government made it possible to tear down one set of private properties (tenements, flophouses, rundown businesses), to compensate the

owners and to resell the land to another set of private developers and owners for office buildings, housing projects, hotels and business plazas.

The program has since spread, prospered and been improved by further legislation—especially by the 1954 Housing Act, which provided for commercial redevelopment, rehabilitation of existing buildings and comprehensive urban planning. To date, \$4.7 billion has been provided for renewal projects which are dramatically visible in the center of many cities from Boston, Hartford and Pittsburgh to San Francisco. The Federal Government is now spending at the rate of \$700 million a year on the program and the President's housing message proposes that this be raised to \$750 million—which is still not nearly enough, according to most people in the field.

New York City has spent the largest amount, but its program in the past has emphasized clearance almost to the exclusion of rehabilitation, and is still far too small for the staggering and unique problems of the great metropolis. The top four cities in total urban-renewal spending are New York (population 7.7 million), Chicago (3.5 million), Philadelphia (2 million), and New Haven, Conn. (152,000). New York has spent \$109 million. If it had had a program of New Haven's scope, it would have spent more than \$1.5 billion.

But even in New Haven some liberals, like that Amherst professor, are uneasy about urban renewal. They charge that taxpayers in effect subsidize the erection of fancy apartment buildings like University Towers (which has a swimming pool and rents to match), Madison Towers and the soon-to-be constructed Crown Towers. The answer, of course, is that there is no subsidy, because the cleared land is sold at market value, and also that those are valuable properties which help to make a beautiful city and markedly increase its tax base. Rebuilding New Haven's center has already added over \$9 million to the tax list of this medium-sized city—\$2.9 million last year alone. Furthermore, we want the people who live in those apartments to stay in the city. We need them and the money they spend.

The liberal critic, however, may say that this answer only confirms his worst fears. "You have shoved out the poor to make homes for the rich," he claims. "You may help the city's finances, but what has happened to the people who used to live on Oak Street?" (Oak Street, once New Haven's most notorious slum, has been wiped away by urban renewal and replaced by those Towers and by a highway connector, among other things.)

There are two answers to this. One is defensive—that those displaced are better housed today than they ever were. The second is more positive—that without urban renewal the problems of the destitute who once lived on Oak Street would not have become the visible responsibility of the community that they are now. Urban renewal is a weapon the community needs to meet that responsibility.

The defensive argument is based on statistics showing that the overwhelming majority of people displaced by urban renewal—the removed Negroes—have moved into better housing; that a lot less slum now exists. Today there simply isn't as much "substandard" housing in New Haven as there was when Oak Street existed.

But are the people who lived on Oak Street and in other renewal areas now paying a higher rent than before? This is another sore point with liberals. The answer is yes—they are, on the average, paying higher rents, but only slightly higher, and for better housing.

Many relocated families—151 of the 886 from Oak Street—have moved into low-income public housing, where they have prior-

ity, and where rents are pegged at 21.8 percent of the family's gross income—usually less than they were paying before. Moreover, many relocated families are on welfare, so that the change, one way or another, in rent has not affected their budget, since the rent is part of their grants.

What about the others? A study just completed of the 100 families most recently relocated into private housing in New Haven shows that they paid an average of 16.8 percent of their income for rent before relocation and 20.3 percent afterward. Thus their rents did go up, on the average, but they are still below the 21.8 percent the public housing laws regard as standard.

That is the general picture. What about individual cases? Having looked over the case-by-case summary of the 100 families, we found that the extremes have become less extreme. The "worst" case before relocation—in terms of percentage of income paid for rent—was that a woman with a large family who made \$365 a month and paid out \$151 a month for rent—40.3 percent of her income. After being relocated, she is now paying \$120 a month—32.9 percent of her income—and is still the worst case.

Most of the increased rent is being paid by those who were paying quite low rents before relocation. The percentages come down from 40 percent but up from 15 percent, and more of them now cluster around 20 percent. These figures do not, of course, tell the whole story about the misery of slum dwellers, but they do indicate that, on balance, urban renewal has not added to the misery.

Is there a long wait and much scrambling around before these families find new homes? Not if the relocation agency can help it. The New Haven agency's 14 workers go to great lengths to help them find the places they want—even if the family, as has happened, turns down the first five offers, and even to the point of playing cupid in one celebrated instance so that a couple could meet public housing standards.

Very well, say some critics, but do the families just move to another slum or Negro ghetto? The answer to this is no. The New Haven family-relocation office has a wall chart showing where all the relocated families have gone from each project. Negroes cluster only in the public-housing projects. Elsewhere, racial distribution is very mixed throughout the city.

It is clearly apparent that urban renewal does not make worse housing for the poor in New Haven, and that holds—despite particular exceptions and soft spots—for the Nation as a whole. Nearly 30 percent of the housing units in New Haven were substandard in the early fifties before the city's urban renewal programs began; today less than 15 percent are, and by 1970 New Haven may be—in this sense at least—the Nation's first slumless city.

The overwhelming majority of the 5,000 families relocated from New Haven's projects—95 percent from the early Oak Street, Church Street, and Wooster Square projects and 99 percent from the more recent Dixwell and Hill High—have been placed in standard, not slum, housing. In the Nation as a whole it is clear from Federal statistics that 9 out of 10 families relocated from renewal areas have moved up to standard housing.

All this, however, is part of the defensive answer to the critics of urban renewal. The more positive reply is that it has brought the urban poor to the community's attention and, at its best, provided not only new houses but new neighborhoods and new sets of possibilities.

It is greatly to the credit of recent anti-poverty tracts like Michael Harrington's "The Other America," as well as of President Johnson's program and, on a smaller scale, Mayor

Richard C. Lee's efforts in New Haven, that the American public has been forced to pay attention to the poor, but urban renewal has been doing the same thing for years. Many liberals uneasy about urban renewal but enthusiastic about the "war on poverty" should remember that experience with family relocation was one of the principal well-springs of the national antipoverty program, uncovering problems of the urban poor that had been kept out of sight for decades and making them a public responsibility.

Urban renewal has a greater potential for eliminating ghettos and segregated living than any other program yet devised—if a city uses it in the right way. It may be possible, with strong fair-housing efforts, to move a small and select number of Negro families, mostly middle class, out into the lily-white suburbs—but the great mass of Negroes will stay right where they are now, in the center of the cities. (Having middle-class Negroes move out, incidentally, is rather a mixed blessing: these are precisely the leaders who are needed in the center of the city, where problems are concentrated.)

Civil rights laws alone, therefore, are not going to alter racial patterns in the Harlems of the land. The only way to achieve integrated living in the blighted centers of our great cities is by clearance—by knocking down the worst slums and starting over.

Then comes the question of what is to be built on the cleared land to achieve a balanced mixture of industrial, commercial, and residential elements in a city's overall plan. It has to be said that cities vary widely in their answers to this question, but the Amherst professor and other liberals like him should not condemn all urban renewal on the strength of a few failures.

In New Haven, for instance, redevelopment has spread over 1,000 acres, and while it is true that luxury apartments, a telephone building and the Oak Street connector have replaced the old Oak Street fire traps, in other renewal areas throughout the city new low-rent housing projects are a major feature—housing for the elderly in Wooster Square, Newhallville, Dwight, and Dixwell, co-op housing in the same neighborhoods. This is new housing, added to New Haven's stock of public housing from the thirties and forties.

One of the cooperative housing ventures now being shown to prospects is directly in the middle of the Dixwell area, New Haven's small version of Harlem. Like all these projects, it will, of course, be integrated. To buy a unit a family has to have \$325 to put down, and must be able to pay from \$91 to \$129 a month, depending on the number of rooms. This does, it is true, put these units out of reach of the very poor, but those who can pay it are not only covering their rent, utilities, and property taxes, but are building up equity. The other day a young former resident of Dixwell walked wide eyed and marveling around Florence Virtue Homes and remarked, "I never thought I'd see anything like this built here."

Too many people, in New Haven and the Nation, equate urban renewal with new business buildings downtown. Important as a healthy downtown is, there is, or can be, much more to it than that. It means the planned rebuilding of the housing and community facilities of deteriorating neighborhoods. Suppose 60 years ago, when Jacob Riis walked Theodore Roosevelt night after night, despairing and angry, through the miserable conditions of Five Points and the Bends, they had had a public agency that could go in, plan, level, and rebuild—what could they not have achieved?

Yet there are still people who say: "New Haven's urban renewal is one of the worst in the country. Too few people are involved in the decisions—the inhabitants of the areas to be renewed must be consulted." And then

there are those whom Mitchell Sviridoff, director of New Haven's antipoverty program, calls "slum romantics," represented by a New Haven literary man: "I used to be in favor of urban renewal. But then I talked to artist friends of mine who couldn't any longer find top-floor studios and cheap cold-water flats."

Put these criticisms together and we have a poignant picture of happy slum dwellers enjoying a varied and interesting life in their cold-water flats until shoved out of their congenial neighborhoods by a few powerful bureaucrats. Their homes are then destroyed and, after a long, messy delay, replaced by badly designed office buildings and luxury apartments. It is a powerful indictment, but it is false.

Although there have been occasions when developers were too quick with the bulldozer, destroying esthetically or historically valuable buildings and viable lower income communities, since 1954 there has been a growing emphasis on neighborhood conservation and on the rehabilitation of existing structures.

And in the late fifties "planning with the people" became a major theme in urban renewal. In New Haven the Wooster Square project was developed in more than 100 meetings with residents of the area, and the same thing is now going on in Dixwell, Newhallville, and the section called "the Hill."

But there are limits. "Planning with the people" cannot always be as dandy and democratic as it sounds. What happens when a neighborhood says it wants no Negroes, no low-income public housing, no site for a public high school? Some times that's exactly "what the people in the area themselves want," but it is a little hard to work with on a communitywide basis.

There has been a progression in American efforts to grapple with the problems of cities and slums. Public housing was the great thing in the late thirties, urban renewal the featured program of the fifties, antipoverty is the rage now. In the beginning the first two were oversold leading to negative reactions as soon as it was found that neither was a cure-all, and one day the same thing may happen with the "war on poverty." It is important not to look on these programs as panaceas, in the first place, and then not to overdo the criticisms, in the second.

The low-income public-housing projects built in the late thirties and the forties with such hope and promise now are said to have become "legalized slums" or "fireproof slums." At the very least, it is desirable for slums to be fireproof, but in fact far more was accomplished than that. Decent housing was provided for hundreds of thousands of families that simply was not available before and which the free market was simply not going to provide.

It is true that public housing did not eliminate slum life and slum behavior, but that merely proved that "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing under public control is not, in itself, enough to win the battle against the slum.

Similarly, urban renewal, which grew in part out of the background of public housing, has now reached a stage where it inspires disillusionment among its onetime liberal supporters. But again they should remember that while there have been many failures and deficiencies, it is a complicated program involving a long and difficult journey between cup and lip.

It still represents the expanded role for public planning for public purposes that liberals long have advocated. That conservatives should attack it is understandable. Liberals, however, would surely be better advised to look behind the standard criticisms of urban renewal and work to make it a more effective tool for the social purposes in which they believe.

ROLLCALL VOTE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 310

Mrs. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, April 14, I was ill and unable to attend the session of the House, and consequently missed the rollcall vote on House Resolution 310, which provided \$50,000 additional expenses for the Committee on Un-American Activities. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX ON PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES AND TRUCKS

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks.

Like all excise taxes imposed during wartime as temporary measures, its reason for being has long since expired. Reasons for its not being are numerous and obvious.

Elimination of the passenger car tax would stimulate purchase of new and used automobiles, creating jobs not only in the basic industry itself but in allied industries and businesses. One business in every six is automotive. One out of every seven workers—more than 11 million Americans—is employed in highway transport.

Automobile production utilizes 21 percent of all steel, 61 percent of all rubber, 32 percent of all zinc, 12 percent of all aluminum, 49 percent of all lead, and 58 percent of all upholstery leather in the United States.

It is estimated that as much as 25 percent of all new passenger cars are sold to firms, salesmen, or others whose livelihoods are dependent on automobile transportation. As much as one-fourth of the \$1.7 billion of automobile excise tax revenue collected annually is added to the consumer cost of producing other goods and services. We have seen national recessions triggered by a slump in the automobile manufacturing industry; repeal of the automobile excise tax could have a tremendous impact on the economy in the opposite direction.

I am hopeful that repeal of the 10-percent excise on cars and trucks will be one of the areas covered by the President when he sends his promised, and long-awaited, excise tax message to the Congress.

MILESTONE IN EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago Daniel Webster, in speaking of the necessity for education in a democratic society said:

Education, to accomplish the ends of good government, should be universally diffused. Open the doors of the schoolhouse to all the children of the land. Let no man have the excuse of poverty for not educating his children.

Since that far-off day, the necessity for education in America has not diminished by so much as one iota; indeed, due to the industrial, technological, and scientific revolutions, it has increased tremendously. Education is still the primary means of accomplishing "the ends of good government." And yet for far too many Americans, poverty is a bar to educating their children. By acting wisely we did loosen that bar and made a giant stride toward an avowed goal of all who have the good of our Nation at heart—the quality education of every American child.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which I voted for closely adheres to the educational recommendations of our President. Its aims have the general approval of educational bodies, such as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers; of religious organizations, such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Agudath Israel of America, the executive council of the Episcopal Church, and the United Presbyterian Church; and of highly respected commentators of American life, including Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Walter Lippmann, and Dr. Robert M. Hutchins. I can also state that the bill had the backing of the people, some of the respected newspapers, and educational authorities in my State of Massachusetts. The following words from a telegram to our great Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK in connection with hearings on the bill are indicative of this support:

I have been instructed by the president of the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents to respectfully notify you that our organization wishes to be recorded as supporting H.R. 2362 and the extension of Public Law 874. We would greatly appreciate your support of these two measures.

(Signed) WILLIAM A. WELCH,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert in the RECORD with my remarks two editorials in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, taken from the Springfield Union, in my home city, and the Boston Globe, both printed on April 13:

[From the Springfield Union, Apr. 13, 1965]

NEW SOURCE OF SCHOOL FUNDS

Is President Johnson's new aid-to-education program the doorway to the Great

Society or the keyhole through which the Federal Government will assume control of the Nation's public schools?

Conceivably it could be either. But those who fear the evil of Federal control may be reacting too strongly too soon. The weight of evidence suggests that State and local authorities can make good use of the new benefits without diminishing their present roles.

For one thing, Federal funds will not be entirely new to many local hands. Springfield, for example, has had a generally favorable experience with money supplied to federally impacted areas.

Nevertheless, the act is a breakthrough to new ground. It will provide \$1.3 billion to 94 percent of the country's public school districts in the year starting July 1, with subsequent authorizations to be measured against needs. Massachusetts is eligible for nearly \$20 million, and Springfield for a portion of that.

The dominant philosophy of this measure—to improve the public education offered youngsters in poor neighborhoods—presents an unprecedented challenge to local administrators and policymaking boards. If lack of money has been an obstacle to spreading the quality of education around evenly in the past, this obstacle, at least, is being lessened.

The task will be to direct the funds where the most good will be done: the underprivileged children, rather than on improvements where education already is good. Communities may have to face hard choices between elaborate new buildings, on the one hand, and additional teachers—perhaps with a bonus for special skills at inspiring slum inhabitants—on the other.

The national civil rights awakening and the war on poverty are very much involved. In fact, the antipoverty effort may overlap the educational effort at some points. That is one of the hazards of falling back on the admittedly cumbersome Federal machinery to finance local programs.

But it is hard to see how the hard-taxed States and localities can make the necessary advances in these areas without reclaiming a greater share of the Federal tax dollar. That is what is happening now, and it will be advantageous to the next generation of Americans if the present generation of administrators measures up to the challenge and opportunity.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 13, 1965]

MILESTONE IN EDUCATION

The signing by President Johnson of the \$1.3 billion aid-to-education bill is a milestone. It was preceded by decades of deadlock and bitter fighting, and in almost all the earlier struggles the sticking point was Federal aid to parochial schools.

The overwhelming Senate vote on the measure Friday night, in just the form the administration wanted it, was Mr. Johnson's greatest legislative victory. He was obviously deeply moved when he affixed his signature to it at the old Texas country school where he had his first lessons, and gave the pen he used to his first teacher.

He said then he deeply believed that "no law I have signed or will ever sign means more to the future of our Nation."

Of the \$1.3 billion aid package for this year, Massachusetts is slated to get a relatively small portion, about \$19.6 million. The reason lies in the distribution formula, which primarily aids schools in areas of poverty. The Bay State's percentage of children from low-income families (under \$2,000) is among the lowest of the States—namely 4 percent. The upshot is that the bulk of the "educational poverty" dollars will go to the rural Southern States. It may help their attitude in education for Negroes.

A more equitable formula may be worked out in years to come. But most Massachu-

setts residents will be content for now that a major general aid-to-education measure has at last been passed. They will recall the acrid row in 1949 over aid to parochial schools in the late Senator Robert A. Taft's bill. The bitterness reached its height in a public spat between Francis Cardinal Spellman and the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The cardinal later quarreled publicly with the late President Kennedy—who believed that direct Federal aid to parochial schools is unconstitutional.

The new measure will provide aid to private and church schools—but indirectly. For pupils in all schools it will provide textbooks, library facilities and a wide assortment of educational services they do not now have.

The main point of the administration is that the Federal aid will go to parochial pupils—not parochial schools. In this way it is hoped that the divisive issue will have been skirted, and that the law will survive a constitutional challenge.

That such a challenge will come is a certainty. There are sincere persons and groups who are all for Federal aid to education—but feel that the new law simply does not meet the constitutional test of the separation of church and State. But even if the high court should knock out this indirect aid to parochial schools, it does not mean that Federal funds would stop flowing into public schools. The two can be separated.

Even with the relatively small size of Massachusetts' allotment, its receipt here will be most welcome. The big lift, of course, would come with legislative passage of the Willis report recommendations, and a new tax program to relieve property owners.

The Federal Constitution is silent, specifically, on aid to religious schools, as well as to parochial pupils. The sooner the Supreme Court makes a definitive ruling, the sooner there will be an end to second-guessing and anxiety.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, there is an organization headquartered near the city of Mercedes, in the 15th Congressional District of Texas, known as the Confederate Air Force.

This is not a warlike organization. It is not a political organization. I suppose one might properly call it a sentimental and patriotic organization. It has one purpose, and only one: to preserve and enshrine the World War II aircraft and to honor the pilots who flew these planes and helped to defeat the tyrannical forces that threatened to overrun the world.

I know personally many of the fine men making up this organization, and I join them in deploring the fallacious news accounts which appeared recently to the effect that incendiary leaflets had been dropped over Selma, Ala., from a Confederate Air Force plane.

Nothing of the kind happened.

The Confederate Air Force has no affiliation whatsoever with any of the white supremacist groups, or with any civil rights group. It does not have even

one member in the Alabama area, nor does it have any aircraft within 1,500 miles of Selma, Ala.

Immediately upon hearing of the false charge, I asked the Federal Aviation Agency to make every possible effort to learn the identity of the pilot responsible for dropping the leaflets. The FAA sent two inspectors to the Selma area from its southern regional office in Atlanta, Ga., and they worked throughout the night running down leads.

The FAA has reported to me:

Our inspectors talked to U.S. marshals, border patrol, National Guard, and FBI people; however, none was able to tell us from which aircraft the drop was made since there were several aircraft in the vicinity.

If the pilot can ever be identified, the Confederate Air Force is prepared to file charges against him for falsely representing himself as a member of that organization.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it highly proper to make this known to you and to the Members of this House, that there is no finer group of men, and no more dedicated Americans, who cherish and love this country and the principles on which it was founded, than the men who compose the Confederate Air Force.

CONTINUITY IN THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my vote to pass the President's succession bill, I wish to make my views on this subject clearly written in the Record.

For more than 1½ centuries this Nation has played a dangerous form of brinkmanship with the highest office in our land, the office which today is without a doubt the most powerful and influential in the democratic world.

This bill, we have passed, will rectify previous inconsistencies and lack of concise planning in the following important processes: discharging the powers and duties of the President in the event of his disability or incapacity; and assuring the continuity in office of the Vice President.

It can readily be seen that hesitation and lack of direction in the above areas lead to potential paralysis of our form of government. Surely none can deny the seriousness of these voids in conjunction with the position our country assumes in the free world. That we have escaped the possible tragic repercussions of these omissions have, as the President has said, "been more the result of providence than any prudence on our part."

I am happy that we have acted with diligence and speed to pass this bill. This was a bill which cut across party lines; partisan politics must and were relegated to extinction so that we could concentrate on the most sacred of legis-

lative pronouncements—the amendment of our Constitution.

The importance of the office of President need not be dwelled on; the importance of the office of Vice President has been indelibly written by the tragic events in November 1963. The Vice President, outside of his increased authority, participation, and responsibility as an elected official, must be a position which allows instantaneous transition to the powers of the Presidency. Under this bill we have a significant departure from previous law on the subject. It declares that when the Vice-Presidency becomes vacant, the President shall nominate a candidate who shall take office after confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress. One of the principal reasons for filling the office of Vice President when it becomes vacant is to permit the person next in line to become familiar with the problems he will face should he be called upon to act as President. If we are to achieve this end, we must assure that the position will be filled by a person who is compatible to the President. Cognizance of this principle has led the major political parties to allow the presidential candidate to choose his own candidate for Vice President. In this way, the country would be assured of a Vice President of the same political party as the President, someone who would presumably work in harmony with the basic policies of the President.

The incapacity or disability of the President has also been resolved by this bill. The Constitution while offering procedure to fill the vacancy of Presidency, in case of death or our Chief Executive, is silent on the procedure when the President is incapacitated by injury, illness, senility, or other infirmity. The country's security and movement must not be entrusted to the immobilized hands or incomprehending mind of a Commander in Chief, unable to command.

We have passed a bill which will allow the transitions of power to move to the Vice President and back to the President in case of the latter's disability. The finalizing of this plan will lend continuity of power and leadership to the office of the Presidency. The past history of our country has illuminated sequences in which this country was stagnated due to a President's disability. I implored this House to act, and they have, to prevent the possibility that this Nation will be encumbered with an Executive who cannot act.

FARLEY ON VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly members of both parties have been fondly aware of a great American and patriot, Mr. James A. Farley, former

Democratic National Committee chairman and Postmaster General, whom we affectionately call "Jim." Mr. Farley was in my district last week and was interviewed by an outstanding reporter, Mr. Jack Kofoed of the Miami Herald on April 7. On April 6, Mr. Farley's wisdom appeared in the Miami Herald strongly supporting the present administration's current policy toward Vietnam. I am happy to have this appear in the body of the RECORD for my colleagues' information:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 6, 1965]

FARLEY LAUDS VIET POLICY

Jim Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic National Committee chairman, declared here Monday he wholeheartedly endorses the Johnson administration policies in Vietnam adding that "we have no other choice in the matter."

"We're in there and it's our fight whether we like it or not," Farley told reporters during a brief stopover in Miami. "The thing I'm sorry about is that other nations are not giving us more assistance."

"I thoroughly approve of what President Johnson and the administration are doing in Vietnam and I think this is the attitude of a vast majority of the American people," Farley said.

He said he sees no danger of Vietnam accelerating into World War III "because of the potential nuclear strength we have."

The 76-year-old Farley, who just completed a 2-week business trip to the Caribbean area as board chairman of the Coca Cola Export Corp., said he believes "Lyndon B. Johnson will undoubtedly go down as one of the truly great Presidents of our country."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 7, 1965]

JACK KOFOED SAYS "THANKS" IS A WORD NOT TOO OFTEN USED

The phone jangled. I answered. The voice was strong, vigorous. It said: "Hello, Jack. This is Jim Farley."

Jim was chairman of the New York Athletic Commission when I went to work in Big Town. He was a man of Irish charm, keen intelligence, an unsurpassed knowledge of politics, and an amazing memory. Farley went on to maneuver Franklin Delano Roosevelt into the Presidency, and get him reelected by the greatest landslide of votes ever known in our history until Lyndon Johnson's election last year. For years Jim has headed Coca Cola's export division.

We liked each other in the old days, but our paths were widely divergent. I saw him a few times during the Roosevelt days, and occasionally thereafter. But James Aloysius Farley's memory reaches far into the past. He isn't one to forget someone he liked when we were all younger and the world was not so tense.

When he passes through Miami on his way to South America, he calls, and we chat a bit. It is the kind of thoughtfulness that makes the world a warmer place in which to live.

My day was brighter because of his call. A small thing in itself, perhaps, but it is a continuation of small things that bring a lift to the heart.

Before Jim's call, the day had started well. I had written a piece about Debbie Reynolds when she was here. A note came from her in Beverly Hills, thanking me for being nice to her.

Thanks is a word not often used, particularly to columnists, so Debbie Reynolds' thoughtfulness, and Jim Farley's, gave me a great lift.

Courtesy is the most neglected of all attributes to a happy life. Lack of it causes thousands of deaths by automobiles, breaks

up marriages, makes enemies of those who should be friends. People like Jim Farley and Debbie Reynolds are instinctively courteous because they are nice people, way deep down nice people. Everyone cannot only help make the days of others pleasanter because of thoughtfulness, but their own much happier, too.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XLVIII

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles from the New York Herald Tribune of March 5, 1965 on the continuing crime crisis in New York.

The articles are a part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," and follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: COURTS, PUBLIC CRITICIZED BY MURPHY

(NOTE.—In yesterday's "New York City in Crisis," the Herald Tribune documented the growing fear of violence in the streets and even the homes of New York as viewed through the eyes of its citizens. Today, Police Commissioner Murphy, three district attorneys, and the head of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association give their views as to what should be done.)

(By Barry Gottehrer, of the Herald Tribune staff)

Charging that judicial decisions and public indifference have handicapped the police department's efforts to protect the city's 8 million people, Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy called yesterday for an urgent re-examination of the "delicate balance between individual liberties and the welfare of society as a whole."

"The weapons, which we have used with success in the defense of our communities, are being blunted by judicial decisions and rusted by public indifference," he said at the monthly luncheon of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

"We ask with increasing urgency for a new look, a new deal, a new frontier. We ask that you consider the road ahead and decide for yourselves whether this overprotection of the individual at the expense of the community will lead to Utopia or to a hell on earth."

The commissioner said he spoke of this not in bitterness or criticism but as a statement of fact.

He added that "when efforts are made, as they have been in the State of New York, to enact legislation formalizing basic concepts (of police authority), they are met with accusations of 'police state' and invasions of individual rights."

"These objections," he said, "come in large measure from well-meaning groups and individuals who pride themselves on their zealous safeguarding of individual rights. What they fail to realize, and what the community as a whole tends to overlook, is that the history of democratic society is a constant reevaluation of the delicate balance between individual liberties and the welfare of society."

New York's growing awareness of violence in the streets was heightened with the release of the crime statistics several weeks ago.

The shocking figures showed that in only 1 year major crimes of violence had risen 13.8 percent, assaults 13.9 percent (and, according to police, many are never reported),

robberies 17.1 percent, forcible rapes 28.1 percent, murders and nonnegligent manslaughters 16.1 percent, and major subway crimes 52 percent.

Contributing to this crisis in crime, said Commissioner Murphy, an attorney, are "rising crime rates and billions of dollars lost by theft and vandalism. They wreak their havoc in needless deaths and injuries. They have as adjuncts the menace of drug addiction, the perversion of our moral standards, and the untold misery of homes broken by crimes of violence and sexual molestations.

"In fact, the fate and future of our young and our Nation are at stake. For those who follow us either must be strengthened to continue our fight or unfortunately become captives or collaborators of the forces of crime."

He said the police are "puzzled and bitter because too often they are ill supplied and ill supported by the community, which hides in its homes, ignoring the battle raging around it," remain the primary deterrent against "complete criminal victory."

He was highly critical of the citizens' prevailing attitude toward the police and said that even if there were some 20th-century Paul Revere to awaken the citizenry to the growing crisis of crime, "he would—I fear—be met with false cries of 'brutality' and answered with a constant refrain, 'Let's not get involved.'"

Emphasizing that professional law enforcement officials do not and never will condone "brutalized extraction of confessions or other illegal acts committed in securing evidence of guilt," he maintained that "carefully controlled legal procedures do not create a gestapo.

"Police states," he continued, "are created when the community loses its perspective, accepts slogans and catchwords instead of facts, and when a government of laws is weakened by corruption of its judiciary, the abdication of its responsibilities by the bar and by the legislative branch—and by public apathy."

He hastened to add, however, that he did not foresee "that horrible day for this great Nation."

Outspoken and hard hitting in his charges of civil apathy and disrespect, Commissioner Murphy gave three specific examples of recent cases emphasizing what he called "some of our current problems."

In the first, policemen, with probable cause to arrest a suspect for robbery, arrived at a hotel where the suspect was staying only to be told that he was out. After explaining to the room clerk what they were after and their concern because the man was known to be armed, the police were allowed to enter the room.

The suspect was not there but the police quickly found a gun, with a clip and cartridges. When the man returned to his room, the police arrested him.

The court ruled, however, that the search for and seizure of the gun, clip, and cartridges was unreasonable, struck down the subsequent conviction of the defendant and ordered a new trial. According to the commissioner, the State will not be permitted to use the weapon in evidence at the retrial.

"Had the accused been in his room," said the commissioner, "the search and the seizure would have been reasonable because it would be considered incidental to his lawful arrest. The gun could then have been properly admitted in evidence and his conviction would have been upheld."

In the second case, a defendant and two companions who had been sitting in a parked car since 10 p.m. were arrested for vagrancy at 4 in the morning. After they had been booked, police searched their car and found two loaded revolvers, caps, women's stockings (one with mouth and eye holes, rope, pillow slips and an illegally manufactured

license plate equipped to be snapped over another plate.

Though they were convicted of conspiracy to rob a bank, the conviction was set aside when the court ruled that the search and seizure of the articles was improper because the car had not been searched at the time of the arrest.

"Thus," according to the commissioner, "very convincing evidence could never be used. As Judge Cardozo said, 'The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered.'"

In the third case, a policeman watched a man drag a heavy suitcase down the street one night, stop at a public bench, place the valise behind him and sit down. The policeman walked over to the man and asked him where he had obtained the valise.

"What valise?" the man answered.

REFUSES TO ANSWER QUESTIONS

When the policeman told the man he had seen him drag the valise down the street and place it behind the bench, the man refused to answer any further questions. At this point, the policeman took the man—and the valise—into the station.

Though subsequent investigation disclosed that the suitcase contained articles that had just been stolen, the court ruled that the arrest was unlawful and the evidence of the burglary illegally seized because the policeman did not know the burglary had been committed when he approached, questioned and detained the defendant. Because of this, the case against the defendant was dismissed.

Concluding his talk, Commissioner Murphy said, "It is an established safety procedure that, before a plane takes to the air, a warning light flashes the words, 'Fasten your seat belts.'"

"I would suggest that every time an attempt is made to further limit the authority of law enforcement, your own warning light go on and that you be prepared to fasten your seat belts for the turbulent flight into the gathering storm."

VIEWS ON CRISIS SERIES

Earlier in the week, Commissioner Murphy offered a special statement of his views to the Herald Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" series. In it, he said:

"It is in the very nature of social and intellectual advancement that we the people impose limitations and rigid restraints on our police. We are a highly civilized society living in the midst of violence. The criminal mind has no principles; only contempt for society manifested in aggression, violence, and defiance of our laws."

Our system of justice frequently favors the criminal and frustrates law and order. But in our advanced society we would have it no other way. When crime erupts in a neighborhood and tension runs high, the law abiding community calls for police action and indulges in wishful thinking; hoping for some master stroke to end the terror. But the police must deal with reality within the framework of established principles of justice and rules of evidence. This kind of challenge impels the police toward ever greater achievement; accomplishments which are reflected each day with an increasing number of arrests on the streets of our city. Last year, felony arrests rose 14.6 percent; misdemeanor arrests increased 17.5 percent.

If crime were purely a police matter there would be less criminal activity in New York City than in any other community on earth. Our police force is a militant, highly disciplined, smooth functioning organization second to none. Police strength is at an all-time high of 26,210. And we are still growing. Five hundred men are scheduled for induction in April and more in June. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, Mayor Wagner has recommended an additional increase of 1,000 men.

Increases in police manpower will undoubtedly improve the community's safety and repose. But I have no illusion that law enforcement alone can eradicate crime. A substantial reduction in crime requires the sustained and coordinated efforts of the courts, the legislature, educators, social scientists and clergy; all working in cooperation with police and supported by the great multitude of law-abiding citizens.

The police are not omniscient; nor can they be omnipresent. It would be impractical and unrealistic to station a policeman on every street and corner, at every business establishment, in every hallway, in every self-service elevator, in every backyard, in every alley; ad infinitum.

The responsibility for crime is not an exclusive police matter. The responsibility must be placed where it belongs on the criminal element and on the society in which crime breeds. The police are neither guarantors nor insurers of social behavior. In New York City, we have the best trained and best equipped law enforcement agency in the world. But we can offer no panacea. To look to the police for a miracle cure for the twisted criminal mind is to flirt with fantasy and ignore the world of reality.

The criminal element constitutes a very small minority but their conduct has great and terrifying impact on the entire community. A high degree of peace and good order is within our grasp. But it requires a massive attack by all of society: The courts, the legislature, teachers, clergy, sociologists, penologists, probation authorities and the great mass of people who respect the law—firm in purpose and united in action—can have a profound effect in achieving a more peaceful community.

In terms of improved public safety, the New York City police force is making more progress at a faster rate than any other law enforcement agency on earth. They will continue to work tirelessly and relentlessly to protect the public peace.

A CITY AFRAID: WHAT FOUR LAWYERS SAY

(NOTE.—Crimes of violence have soared in New York City and the fear of violence continues to spread among the city's 8 million people. As they have never been before, New Yorkers today are afraid—in their streets, in their parks, in their subways, and even in the privacy of their own homes and apartments. Here, for the Herald Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" series, four experts, the men who must supply the answers, explore the problems and offer possible answers.)

Frank D. O'Connor, district attorney, Queens County:

"There is a growing temptation to believe that somewhere in the process of law enforcement, criminal investigation and prosecution there is a magic switch that only needs to be thrown to solve the problem of crime. All of us in law enforcement sincerely wish there was such a switch.

"But reality is more complicated and stubborn. And to compound the problem is the fact that our concept of crime is changing.

"No field of human concern, therefore, is marked by more ferment and contradictions today than the criminal law.

"Some people cry out for rehabilitation and prevention, others for defendants rights, still others for swift prosecution and long sentences and still others for shorter sentences, etc.

"If all the suggested panaceas were embraced indiscriminately, the crime cost already second only to defense—would probably exceed the defense budget itself and still be of doubtful value.

"To devise a new, balanced and realistic attack on crime, we must see the whole problem and distinguish reality from illusion.

"Unless guilty people can be proven guilty, the law and all it can ever offer ideally by way of rehabilitation and prevention is at once academic and even laughable.

"And yet, law enforcement is being divested of many of the sound instruments of swift investigation and secure prosecution by courts concerned with antiseptic almost angelic methods of proof and with principally one phase of the problem—the rights of defendants. These rights are precious but they are only part of the complex of problems and interests involved with crime. Layman and professional must try to see the whole problem and make a conscientious and enlightened study of all the values involved and then act. From a presidential panel to a metropolitan institute of criminology such study is already being considered.

"In my judgment, these are some of the more important areas where courageous and creative study and action must follow:

"The effectiveness of the policeman on the beat must be enhanced. His may not be the last word on the law but it is very often the very first. The law must be definite and realistic enough to enable him to act with dispatch and sureness.

"The public must accept a single standard of justice not a double one—when they are injured and when they are injuring.

"Some laws which are in a state of flux—like those involving gambling and narcotics addiction—must frankly be revised, pruned or outrightly abolished. Addiction is estimated to be related to approximately half of our urban crime. It is primarily a sickness and should be treated as such.

"First offenders should be helped in the fullest sense of that term. That does not mean excused or ignored.

"Fair and equal treatment, especially with regard to sentencing must characterize our justice.

"Courtesy and reasonable dispatch must accompany the handling of cases. Plea-taking should not be regarded as a subject for suspicion. Many factors enter into taking a plea and mercy may be one of them in some instances but so, too, may information. Its value to the system is also important as a factor in reducing the backlog.

"We must continue to develop and be able to use an ever improving 20th-century investigative technology on the 20th-century criminal syndicate.

"We must remember, however, that there is no ultimate magic in the criminal law. For the law establishes only an immediate context wherein other arts, disciplines, professions and sciences must be allowed to work their power ultimately over the moral character, mental and physical life of the offender during a long period of time and under the most ideal circumstances.

"As a background of this professional re-evaluation of the criminal law, there must certainly also be a concurrent promoting of a fair and more humane society, for crime is still rooted, in part at least, in the other complicated social, economic and moral problems of our time."

Aaron E. Koota, district attorney, Kings County:

"The problem of crime basically is twofold. First are the underlying causes or conditions in our society which are conducive to crime. Within this category lie the absence of fair and equal employment and educational opportunities, poverty, discrimination, lack of proper housing and environment. These, however, present long-range problems to which are addressed the studied efforts of experienced and knowledgeable public officials and civil leaders.

"But how do you approach the second phase, which is the immediate problem of dealing with day-by-day crimes of violence? In the County of Kings, there has been a substantial increase in violent crimes. To meet this expanding challenge of the criminal,

immediate and vigorous law enforcement is essential.

"A serious obstacle to such enforcement lies in the present confused and muddled state of the law in areas such as search and seizure, wiretapping, confessions, the right of the accused to counsel and the oft-competing claims to jurisdiction of the State and Federal courts.

"Prompt legislation to clarify these uncertainties is essential or law enforcement will face insuperable obstacles. What is essential to stem the tide of crime is not so much an extension of the powers of the police as it is a resolution of doubt concerning the extent of the present powers.

"An all-out assault by all law enforcement agencies within the framework of the law is imperative so that the streets, our parks, our subways may be made safe against the onslaught of the hoodlum and thug and restored to the decent citizens of our community where they rightfully belong. Thus can the city of New York maintain and enhance its reputation as a city of law and order.

"It is essential, also, that criminal business be dispatched with all possible speed. Justice delayed is justice denied. Where a backlog of cases exists, crime is encouraged. Since September 1962, following court reorganization and with the cooperation and counsel of the administrative board of the New York State judicial conference, of which Mr. Presiding Justice George J. Beldock is at the helm in the second judicial department, the backlog of pending cases has been considerably reduced, and our criminal calendars are reasonably up to date."

John A. Braisted, Jr., district attorney, Richmond: "As far as the court backlog in Richmond is concerned, there is a backlog which has been caused primarily by reason of the fact that in 1964 there were only six trial terms. We believe that the backlog will be taken care of or removed, because there now have been assigned 10 trial terms.

"My personal opinion on reducing crime is that there is a need to establish a more equitable balance between the rights of the public to be protected from criminal violence and the rights granted to a person accused of crime. Our appellate courts have liberally construed the rights of an accused at the expense of public security. Victims of crime have become the forgotten people. There is a direct relationship between the rate of crime and the probability of conviction. Since the probability of conviction and subsequent imprisonment have decreased as a result of these decisions, the rate of crime has increased. This is only one cause for the rise of our crime rate. There are many others.

"There is a great need for good housing and good employment. The depressed economic condition of our people leads many of them to crime.

"We must quickly restore to the police some of the power they had to deal with crime. Because of the decisions rendered in many cases, the police are afraid to act. They are not sure if they have made a lawful arrest and are afraid of civil suits.

"If they had the power, there is no question about it, crime would be reduced."

Frank S. Hogan, district attorney, New York County: "I do not want to make a statement on a subject so all-embracing. Anything I did say would be inadequate. I don't want to give the impression by making a statement that this office has the pat solutions. Because we don't."

Isidore Dollinger, district attorney Bronx County: "Though the Herald Tribune offered to give Mr. Dollinger any amount of time and cooperation to prepare his statement, the Bronx district attorney first delayed doing it, then, after a half-dozen calls, said, 'I'm much too busy.'"

John J. Cassese, president, Patrolmen's Benevolent Association: "An essential element to the control of crime in New York City is the restoration of public respect for the police uniform.

"Initially, this can best be accomplished by the adoption of a get-tough policy in the police department. Juvenile delinquents, known criminals, and potential violators of the law must not be allowed a continued opportunity to scorn and ridicule policemen. Rather than enjoying the protection of civil liberties groups and bleeding hearts, this element should be made to feel the full force and effect of the law, with the police officer supported by his superiors and the courts meting out punishment in keeping with the crime.

"Too many cries of police brutality and too much leniency have become the order of the day. Under such circumstances, effective law enforcement is virtually impossible."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART XLIX

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues two articles on the crisis in the flight of jobs and school dropouts in New York.

The articles are part of the "New York City in Crisis" series and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 5, 1965.

The articles follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: FIGHTING THE FLIGHT OF JOBS—ACTION ON TWO FRONTS

(By Barrett McGurn)

The businessmen who are organizing to fight the flight of New York City blue collar jobs, and to combat other municipal problems, worked yesterday on two parallel fronts. They sought the cooperation of labor and of City Hall, and were encouraged by the reaction of both.

H. Chandler Turner, Jr., president of the 3,200-member Commerce and Industry Association of New York, this city's largest businessmen's organization, reported on talks with key figures in both groups. He spoke to Louis Broido, former executive vice president of Gimbels, who is Mayor Wagner's commissioner for commerce and industrial development. He talked also with Harry Van Arsdale, president of the city central labor council.

Mr. Turner is part of the three-man committee representing 70 presidents and board chairman of the largest companies of New York, and of the world, in attempting to provide a citizens' answer to this city's difficulties.

Mr. Turner told Commissioner Broido that although businessmen want to retain the dominant control of the projected industrial development corporation, they do want some city government representation. He made it clear that the purpose of the businessmen's movement is to find answers to city difficulties, not to fight city hall.

A 2-hour talk with Mr. Van Arsdale assured Mr. Turner that "I think he'll be behind our program." The aim of the businessmen is to get a half dozen labor leaders representing the textile, printing, building construction, and other fields to join forces. The businessmen want at least some of the

union leaders as directors of the job-sponsoring industrial corporation.

The talk with Mr. Brodlo was an effort to assuage what the businessmen understand are ruffled feelings at city hall. The Commerce and Industry Association head tried to make plain that the businessmen's initiative is not a personal attack on Mayor Wagner. Many of the persons active in the movement are convinced that it is essential to have City Hall's good will to obtain needed zoning variances, favorable taxation and even the assignment of city property for development as factory sites. The businessmen have their eyes on the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn, on Governors Island and on other areas. They also are mindful that the city government of Philadelphia gave a successful businessmen's reform drive 2 square miles of municipal land for development.

The hope with labor is that unions will not "throw the book" at factories willing to move in from other parts of the country. In this regard Mr. Van Arsdale himself has sent a chill down out-of-State entrepreneurial spines by getting a 5-hour day and a 5-day week for his own electricians in New York.

The 197-year-old New York Chamber of Commerce, America's oldest businessmen's organization, and another of the main supporters of the reform drive, held its monthly meeting yesterday in its lofty-ceilinged assembly hall at 65 Liberty Street and approved all that has been done to date.

Walter F. Pease, president of the chamber, put his emphasis on excluding politicians "at least at first" for fear that they might reduce the effort "to one more of the 19 or 20 committees that have ended by rendering a report, and accomplishing little or anything else." He agreed that the businessmen at a later stage should "cooperate and work with" city officials.

Meanwhile, City Councilman Theodore R. Kupferman, Republican-Liberal of Manhattan, introduced a resolution in the council commending the businessmen's reform campaign in behalf of what "has aptly been termed a city in crisis."

PICKING UP THE DROPOUTS—A \$5.1 MILLION WAR CHEST

(By Terry Smith)

Armed with a \$4.6 million Federal grant, New York began its first major attack on its massive school dropout problem yesterday.

Mayor Wagner announced the grant and the initiation of the Neighborhood Job Corps, through which 5,400 of the city's 77,000 unemployed youngsters will get jobs during the next 6 weeks.

The goal, said the Mayor at a press conference at city hall yesterday morning, is to "break the cycle of poverty—to see that the children of poverty do not become the fathers of poverty."

In the afternoon, Mayor Wagner went to a youth center in East Harlem and spoke briefly to 50 of the first recruits, urging them to get the most out of their jobs and reminding them that "the success of the program depends on you."

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is the first of the Federal antipoverty programs to be integrated into the city's antipoverty operations, but Mayor Wagner said "several" others would be announced during March.

The Youth Corps will provide part-time jobs for 900 teenagers still in school who would otherwise be required to drop out to help support their families, and full-time work for another 4,500 teenagers who are out of school and out of work.

The program will cost \$5,139,785, of which \$4,621,890 is provided by the Department of Labor, and \$517,895 by the city. According to City Council President Paul R. Scervane, who is also the chairman of the city's Anti-Poverty Operations Board, some 70 percent

of the money will be used for teenage wages and the remaining 30 percent will provide for administrative expenses and special counseling.

The 900 teenagers on part-time work will have jobs within their schools as library and clerical aids, recreational assistants, switchboard operators and kindergarten and nursery school aids. None of the students will work more than 15 hours a week.

The youngsters working full time will work 30 hours a week or less in jobs created by the city, community agencies and other anti-poverty programs. The city will provide about 2,000 of the jobs and Mayor Wagner emphasized that in no case will a Youth Corps worker deprive someone else of an existing job. Instead, new jobs will be created, such as clerical assistants, aids in the city laboratories, museum guides, etc.

For each hour of work, the teenagers will receive \$1.25.

The screening of the Youth Corps recruits has already been started by agencies such as JOIN and HARYOU-ACT at centers in all five boroughs.

A maximum salary of \$37.50 per week may not seem a lot, but it obviously meant a great deal to 20-year-old Robert Matos, who was one of the 50 recruits who listened to Mayor Wagner's speech at a JOIN Center on East 104th Street yesterday. Robert, who lives with his parents in an East Harlem tenement, has been assigned a job as a receptionist in a community center in Long Island City, Queens.

He begins work there Monday and he seemed pleased with the prospect of bringing in \$37.50 per week. "At least it's a start," he said.

THE CHALLENGE AND PROMISE OF FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, seldom in the history of international relations has an instrument of policy been either more productive or more abused than the American foreign aid program. For 20 years the American people have provided assistance ranging from the reconstruction of the European economies left shattered by World War II to the introduction of basic health and educational facilities in countries that are just beginning the long process of development. Throughout the period we have squabbled among ourselves over the real and alleged shortcomings of our aid and whether we ought to have an aid program at all.

It is true that foreign aid has not fulfilled the hopes with which we undertook it, but that has more to do with the extravagance of our hopes than with the failures of our aid. The value of foreign aid in the past is not open to serious challenge. The Marshall plan saved Europe from collapse and Communist domination after World War II and set Europe on the road to its current prosperity. Nor has our aid been ineffective in the much more difficult task of contributing to economic growth in the less developed nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. According to the calculations of Dr. Isaiah Frank, of Johns Hopkins University, economic growth in the less developed world since 1950 has been at the impressive rate of 4.2 per-

cent a year. Notwithstanding the rapid increase in population, a per capita growth rate of about 2 percent has been achieved. The last 15 years have seen a measurable improvement in the lives of many millions of people in the world's poorer countries.

The American aid program has contributed to impressive economic progress of which both recipients and donor may well be proud. Greece, Israel, and Taiwan have all developed strong economies with the assistance of American aid. India has made steady if unobtrusive progress while maintaining a functioning democracy among a population which is over a third that of the entire underdeveloped world. Western aid in the form of foreign exchange and surplus food has substantially helped Pakistan and India, taken together, to maintain an industrial growth rate of about 8 percent a year and to strive to produce sufficient food for their soaring populations. American aid to Latin America has offset the effects of a long-term deterioration in the terms of trade for Latin American exports. In Africa, where development is hampered by a lack of skills of all kinds, Western aid is bringing about an educational revolution.

The Alliance for Progress, which has just completed its fourth year, has now, despite shortcomings of administration and other difficulties, achieved a measure of success. Preliminary statistics for 1964 show an average increase of per capita income in Latin America of 3 percent, part of which may in fact be the result of our aid program. The construction of dwelling units and schoolrooms, roads, some new industries, new hospitals, somewhat increased food production and expanded business activity, has generated some new attitudes, and the beginnings of commitments to social and economic reforms in several of the Latin American republics. Again, some of this has been helped by our Government's efforts.

In most of the less developed nations, whether they are under democratic government or military rule or some form of homegrown socialism, there has been no general tendency toward communism. In some areas, Communist pressure has ceased to be an important threat. In general, the aid the rich countries have provided to the poor countries over the past decade and a half has contributed to positive economic progress in the face of enormous obstacles, and has helped stem the tide of anarchy and communism.

Foreign aid has not, by any means, achieved all that we had hoped, but it has achieved a great deal and can, if properly reformed, achieve much more. We have underestimated the scope of our commitments and have been disillusioned. It would be a great misfortune if we were now totally to abandon foreign aid, not because it has failed, which it has not, but because we expected too much of it.

As George Woods, president of the World Bank, has pointed out, the essential fact about foreign aid is that "despite political upheavals, despite inflation, despite outmoded social structures, despite

unparalleled population growth, despite inadequate savings and investment, the underdeveloped world is moving forward and the whole process of development is acquiring an encouraging momentum"—address to the Investment Bankers Association, Hollywood, Fla., December 5, 1963.

Foreign aid is neither the panacea that we took it to be 10 or 15 years ago nor the bleak failure that those who oppose it seem to think it is. When progress achieved is weighed against obstacles overcome, we can take some pride in our record and view our future aid—if it is intelligently modernized—with modest optimism. Above all, as a group of American development experts recently suggested, we must lengthen the time horizons in our thinking and in our action because, as they put it:

We are dealing with the development century and not the development decade "New Directions in Foreign Aid"—statement of experts published by Indiana University.

When all the revolutions of the 20th century—national, ideological, military and economic—are assessed in the perspective of history, it is not unlikely that the revolution of economic development will be judged the most important. Prior to World War II economic development was something that took place in the West. In the last 20 years it has become global, and it is changing the face of societies that have been virtually stagnant for centuries. With a growth rate of a little over 4 percent a year, the total income of the underdeveloped world has about doubled in the last 15 to 20 years. This means that a revolution is being wrought in the lives of the great majority of the world's population and, like all revolutions, it carries both the promise of a better life and the certainty of untimely disappointments and profound dislocations.

For the foreseeable future, the world economic revolution is likely to generate many more problems than it will solve. One problem is the unevenness of economic development, not only among countries but within the various sectors of national economies. Specifically, in many underdeveloped countries industrial growth proceeds at a satisfactory rate while agriculture lags far behind—so much so that in some countries agricultural production per capita is less than it was 10 or 15 years ago. At best, food production the world over is barely keeping pace with population growth.

Another critical problem is trade. In the last 20 years world trade has expanded at an unprecedented rate but most of the expansion has taken place in trade among the advanced countries and in exports from the advanced to the less developed countries. Exports from the poorer countries, chiefly primary products, have not risen greatly. As a result, these nations are unable to earn the foreign exchange necessary to finance their development. To some extent this is attributable to neglect of export industries by the underdeveloped countries; the more important reason is simply that they are in the wrong businesses, exporting primary products such as basic foodstuffs and industrial raw materials

for which demand rises very slowly. The consequence has been a continuous decline in the prices of commodities exported by the less developed countries and increasingly higher prices of products imported from advanced nations. The deterioration of the terms of trade thus threatens to choke off economic development unless the advanced nations provide a steady and adequate flow of essential foreign exchange.

Another problem arising from the slow growth of export earnings is a mounting burden of foreign debts. Many less-developed countries are so heavily burdened with short-term debts that an alarmingly high proportion of their future export earnings—in some cases up to 25 or 30 percent—is pledged to debt service over the next few years. They confront great threats to their continued economic development:

First. They may be compelled to forego necessary imports to service their debts.

Second. They cannot afford, and lenders are unlikely to provide, further loans at conventional rates of interest.

Overriding all the other threats to economic development is the population increase. At the current rate, the world population will double in the next 40 years and most of the increase will occur in the underdeveloped countries. To maintain even their existing levels of nutrition, housing, health, and education, the poorer nations will have to double their production in the next 40 years. About two-thirds of all their potential new investment will be devoted to meeting the needs of increased population rather than raising living standards. Unless the growth of population is brought under control, it is unlikely that even the most intelligent development programs will be able to achieve and sustain acceptable living standards.

It is clear in any case that, far from having run its course, one form or another of foreign aid remains a necessity if development is to continue in the world's poorer nations. They will require an adequate and reliable flow of unconventional development lending—loans provided at minimal rates of interest with long repayment periods.

For all its enlightened generosity in the field of foreign aid, the United States has not yet committed itself to the idea of a development century and to its own long-term interest in making it a success. We have not yet been willing to acknowledge that there can be no lasting security for the affluent in a sea of turmoil based chiefly on human misery and that the development of the world's poorer nations is not only a challenge to our conscience—which it rightfully should be—but a matter of elemental self-interest.

The scope of the development problem and our own vital interest in it answers the question of whether our aid has run its course. It has not; nor is it likely to before the end of this development century. It would free our vision if we could lay to rest the irrelevant debate over whether foreign aid has accomplished all that it can and whether it is permanent or temporary. The an-

swer is that the stability it has helped to create is still unsure and may not become sure or reliable for a long, long time. As immutable as time itself is the proposition that that stability is essential to our survival as a free, rich, and powerful country, justly proud of its free enterprise system.

Once the need for stability is understood and acknowledged, we can turn to more pertinent questions. What kind of aid is most needed and by whom? How can we make our aid as efficient and productive as possible? How can we improve our own bilateral aid programs? To what extent, and in what ways, can we cooperate with other nations to provide economic aid through multilateral channels, converting it from a national charity to an international responsibility? I should like to comment on some of these questions in a broader discussion of how we can participate most effectively in the development century.

I believe that the most important, single contribution the United States could make to the success of the development century would be the multilateralization of much or most of our economic assistance. I strongly support the proposal made by Senator FULBRIGHT that our development loans—which is to say, that part of our aid which finances basic industrial and economic development as distinguished from military assistance and other forms of aid designed to serve short-term political purposes—be diverted from bilateral management by the Agency for International Development to multilateral management by the World Bank's Development Association.

Three major purposes would be served by channeling our development aid through IDA: First, it will establish economic development as an essential objective in itself, to be promoted by an agency with no political goals except the development of the world's poorer nations; second, it will largely remove economic aid from the mounting pressures of our own domestic politics; third, it will begin to convert the assistance of the rich nations to the poor nations from separate acts of generosity to something closer to a community responsibility.

Internationalization, I believe, will advance the ultimate political objectives of our aid—as distinguished from its short-term political objectives—which are to build a world community in which freedom is secure and prosperity is at least a realistic hope for all men. In the words of the Foreign Aid Task Force of the Republican Citizens Committee's Critical Issues Council, the purpose of our aid is nothing less than "to help build conditions aimed at a peaceful resolution of today's struggle with international communism and, with this, to help shape a certain kind of world community"—critical issues paper No. 8, page 6.

Far from being a major departure in American foreign policy, the internationalization of aid represents a logical transition in the United States ventures in world order. These ventures have consisted largely of the creation of international institutions that provide

some essential but unspectacular services. Among these are such "functional" international organizations as the Universal Postal Union and the International Telecommunications Union. Beyond the useful but limited services which they perform, these institutions produce a beneficial byproduct, as Eugene Black has pointed out, in that they "foster the habit of officials getting together with their equivalents in other countries in order to try to work out solutions to common problems" and in some instances foster the creation of a genuinely international civil service—Eugene R. Black, "Ventures in World Order," Princeton Alumni Weekly, June 1, 1962.

Internationalism became a major force in world affairs after the First World War. The League of Nations soon foundered but the World Court survived and the International Labor Organization, which was created along with the League, not only survived but has come to exert important influence on labor laws, working conditions and industrial relations in many countries. The League itself had some limited political successes and some notable successes in the social and economic field.

From these cautious, occasionally fruitful ventures in world order the idea began to take hold that communities of national effort toward peace made more sense than unbridled nationalism. It became unmistakably clear in World War II that the United States would be required to take a leading role in building international institutions.

After World War II, the United States committed itself to military and diplomatic international cooperation. But we have not yet shown a commensurate willingness to unite our efforts with those of other nations in the equally important field of social and economic cooperation with the world's less developed nations. We have a good deal to make the United Nations an effective multinational instrument for keeping the peace, although recently our Government has shown signs of wearying in this effort, and clearly better leadership is required. We have committed ourselves to multinational defense alliances such as NATO and the Organization of American States, although here, too, there has been an unfortunate deterioration of United States leadership. But in the field of social and economic assistance we have clung tenaciously to a bilateralism that I believe to be outmoded.

The institutions for international cooperation in aid already exist. The World Bank is a solid success and its soft loan affiliate, the International Development Association, is a going concern, as is the Inter-American Development Bank. We have only to decide to make full use of their facilities. This decision in turn depends on our willingness to make a fundamental commitment to the idea that we are living in the development century; that the United States has a humane and economic interest in the development of the poor nations, and that the assistance that the rich countries can provide is to their collective advantage and therefore should be car-

ried intelligently and reasonably as a multinational enterprise.

A significant, if preliminary, basis has been laid for converting aid from bilateral, temporary instrument of policy to one that is multilateral and permanent. The success of the Marshall plan was due in no small measure to its cooperative execution by the OEEC, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. The United Nations performs limited but useful social and economic functions through such specialized agencies as the special fund and the expanded program of technical assistance. Most important of all, the World Bank, officially the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, has established itself as a successful and profitable banking institution providing loans on commercial terms for developmental purposes.

The International Development Association was formed in 1960 as an affiliate of the World Bank to provide funds for essential projects that developing countries could not finance by conventional loans. The IDA, which is under the same management and staff as the Bank, extends 50-year no-interest credits bearing an annual service charge of three-fourth of 1 percent. By July 1964, IDA had extended 57 loans amounting to \$778 million to 22 countries in Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America for such purposes as transportation, agriculture, industrial development, power, telecommunications, water supplies and education.

I believe it would be a great advance for American interests, for the development of the poorer nations, and for the broader purpose of building a world community if the United States were to channel much or most or all of its development lending through such international agencies as IDA and the Inter-American Development Bank. Having taken the lead over the last 20 years in efforts to build an international security community, it is now time for the United States to take the lead in building a no less important community for social and economic development.

As the Republican Citizens' Critical Issues Council pointed out last year, aid channeled through international agencies can often achieve American objectives—long-term objectives, it should be added, not short-term manipulations—better than direct U.S. aid.

It has been learned from experience—

Said the council—

that frequently there is less resentment and resistance from an underdeveloped nation when the World Bank, for example, rather than AID, conditions a loan on a specific government concession to private enterprise. (Critical issues paper No. 8, p. 16.)

The premise of multilateral aid is that economic development is itself a vital objective, apart from considerations of the political ties it may generate. In the words of George Woods:

Economic aid is not an infirmity which we must learn to live with—which we render tolerable by making it a byproduct of programs which are created and implemented

essentially with the view of furthering the diplomatic, political or export objectives of the industrialized countries. Economic assistance to developing countries should be the central objective—not the peripheral one—of the aid programs. (Address to the Investment Bankers Association, Hollywood, Fla., Dec. 5, 1963, pp. 15-16.)

Economic development, in short, is an end in itself—vital to the aspirations of the poor and the security of the rich. It should properly be administered by international lending agencies with no political objectives to be advanced, no special interests to be appeased, and indeed no reason to exist except for the promotion of economic development.

Again in the words of Mr. Woods:

Unlike nationally administered aid programs, World Bank loans have not been concerned with political objectives, with short-term commercial factors, or with military considerations. We have been able to call the shots as we saw them, from a strictly economic and financial point of view. We have been concerned solely with assuring the best economic performance by the developing countries. Because we have no objective to serve but economic development, we have been able to be hardheaded in our adherence to economic criteria to an extent not open to national aid programs. (Ibid., p. 8.)

There is a profound psychological problem involved in bilateral aid of which an international agency like the World Bank is free. Bilateral loans carry an inevitable connotation of charity which, put in the worst light, has an element of humiliation for the borrower and irritation or embarrassment for the lender. Neither can ever quite forget that one is in need, the other without material need. Human nature being what it is, this is not the kind of relationship that imparts self-confidence or self-sufficiency to the borrower or generosity and tolerance to the lender. Genuinely grateful though he may be, the borrower eventually will resent his benefactor because he is rich. The lender in turn, may become exasperated with the borrower because he is needy, in some ways inefficient, and ungrateful besides.

There has been a great deal of talk about ingratitude for our aid, and it is mostly nonsense. Effusive gratitude of the sort that many Americans seem to want is contrary to human nature. The United States, for example, was not overly appreciative to France for helping us to win our Revolution in 1783; in fact, we almost went to war with France a few years later. Nor did the Halls of Congress ring with gratitude to England during the century that the British fleet provided us with free security from the power politics of Europe; on the contrary, the 19th century was a period of most eloquent and outspoken Anglophobia in America. The point is that thankfulness is an unrealistic objective of foreign policy and a most unworthy objective for a great nation.

Magnanimity in politics—

Said Edmund Burke—

is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together. (Edmund Burke, second speech on conciliation with America, Mar. 22, 1775.)

Bilateral aid has been described as an instrument for influencing the policies of recipient countries. In many instances, our aid has given us temporary leverage, although often at the cost of ingrained resentments on the part of proud nationalist leaders. The belief that aid gives us direct and immediate influence on the behavior of its beneficiaries is belied by our experiences. The United States provided massive assistance to the Republic of Korea and fought a war to defend its independence. When the peace negotiations reached a decisive state in 1953, the government of President Syngman Rhee attempted to abort them. The United States provided billions of dollars to revive France after World War II, and now a fully recovered France is creating difficulties for American policy all over the world. In the last few months our generosity to Indonesia has been rewarded by the burning of American libraries while the Egyptians have burned down our libraries and invited us to "go jump in the lake besides."

The political usage of aid has been appraised by the Critical Issues Council of the Republican Citizens Committee.

It is imperative—

The council wrote—

that we distinguished clearly between hostility and mere differences of opinion, or even sharp clashes of view on particular matters * * *. The country's direction must be clear; but, in pursuing basic objectives on which there is agreement, differences in judgment will always be found on individual points of foreign policy. Moreover, our own judgment may not always be right. Besides, we stand for independence, and in exercising independence, countries must be free to seek their own way through the perplexities of today's situations, in a manner they believe serves their own interests. We are trying to build free nations, not to make satellites. It is communism that demands subservience. (Critical issues paper No. 8, p. 9.)

If direct and immediate political leverage were the basic objective of American aid, I would suggest that we terminate our aid programs at once. The crude exercise of political influence is not our basic objective. The valid and rational goal of economic aid is economic development, which in turn has a vital and direct bearing on our efforts to create a world environment in which free societies can be secure and prosperous.

If this is accepted as the purpose of our aid, then it follows that our aid will be effective to the extent, and only to the extent, that it is provided without taint or suspicion of self-serving motivation. A single nation providing aid may or may not be free of ulterior political motives, but even if it is, it is almost impossible for it to be free of the suspicion of political purpose. Entirely valid economic advice may thus be rejected because the recipient suspects that the real purpose of conditions attached to aid is not to encourage economic efficiency but to influence an election or to gain some commercial advantage.

The American Ambassador to Argentina, for example, recently found it necessary to make an extraordinary effort to persuade the Argentine Government that

a delay in aid disbursements had nothing to do with a stalemate in negotiations between Argentina and certain American-owned oil companies whose contracts had been canceled over a year ago. Ambassador Martin is an able diplomat and he may succeed in allaying Argentine suspicions, but the fact remains that, on its face, the delay in aid disbursements can as well be taken to be a lever on the oil negotiations as the purely "technical and legal" matter that the State Department says it is. The question of the oil contracts is an extremely emotional one in Argentina and it is conceivable that suspicion of U.S. policy was a factor in the election of Peronist candidates in Argentina's congressional elections on March 14. This is not to suggest that the United States should not take steps to help assure a fair settlement for the oil companies but only that it would be most unfortunate if the effectiveness of our aid program were compromised by its use as a lever in a private commercial dispute.

The decisive advantage of the international lending agencies is their economic objectivity and the fact that this objectivity is well known to both contributors and borrowers. As Eugene Black has put it:

Economic priorities are inevitably confused when economic objectivity is lost—and economic objectivity is not easy when aid is influenced by political ends * * *. The Bank, and IDA, for example, can apply what should be the real criterion—the practical merits of the particular case. Because they are known to have no ulterior motive, they can exert more influence over the use of a loan than is possible for a bilateral lender. They can insist that the projects for which they lend are established on a sound basis, and—most important—they can make their lending conditional upon commensurate efforts by the recipient country itself. (Address to Board of Governors of the World Bank, Sept. 18, 1962.)

Even if our development lending were channeled entirely through the international lending agencies, much of our foreign aid would necessarily remain bilateral—military assistance, surplus foods, stopgap budgetary support and all the various forms of assistance that have short-term political aims as distinguished from long-range economic objectives. Broadly speaking, the division of aid between bilateral military and political assistance and multilateral development assistance reflects the reality of a world which, though still divided by national and ideological rivalries, is struggling slowly and painfully toward the creation of a broader community.

The distinction is of the greatest importance. In the words of a statement issued by some 50 American development experts:

This generation lies between two worlds; an Old World in which sovereign national states regard each other as allies or enemies; and a New World, still adolescent, in which nation states recognize their interdependence and engage cooperatively in the tasks of mutual benefit and concern.

What is commonly called foreign aid is a mixture of governmental measures appropriate to the Old World and of others quite different that are appropriate to the new.

Military aid and short-term politically motivated economic aid * * * could suffice to the Old World. Developmental assistance * * * is an essential additional activity of the New World of increasingly interdependent states. ("New Directions in Foreign Aid," statement of U.S. development experts published by Indiana University.)

The multilateralization of development lending is the most important reform needed in our foreign aid. There is also need for improvement, however, in the conduct of the programs that would remain bilateral should our development lending be internationalized. A most desirable reform in this category would be a continuing review of both country programs and the bilateral aid program as a whole by nongovernmental economists and technical experts. The participants in the periodic reviews should be wholly independent, engaged by the Government solely for the purpose of surveying the conduct of aid, documenting both its successes and shortcomings, and providing objective information to the Congress and the public.

There is a need for even greater selectivity in our aid than has already been achieved. Indeed, what has been achieved thus far is concentration rather than selectivity. The President pointed out in his foreign aid message on January 14, 1965, that 64 percent of our development aid went to only 7 countries in fiscal year 1964; he did not point out that we nonetheless maintain aid programs of one sort or another in about 90 countries. Many of these are designed to do nothing more than maintain an American "presence"—an irritating and purposeless presence, in some instances, the elimination of which might very well lead to better relations with the countries concerned.

A final and most important need is public education. It would be useful and constructive if the administration were to undertake a sustained effort to inform the American people quite candidly as to what can and cannot be expected of foreign aid and why it should be regarded not as something abnormal but as an instrument of policy in this development century. As the Critical Issues Council points out, the resolution of the current controversy over aid ultimately depends on the quality of political leadership exerted in its behalf.

Aid—

They write—

has few constituents, and few politicians ready to fight for it. More important, there are few ready to educate for it. A wide, sustained, educational effort should be promoted to bring the aid story to more people. (Critical issues paper No. 8, p. 4.)

Such an educational effort should seek, above all, to remind Americans of both the challenge and the promise of foreign aid. The challenge is to our enlightened self-interest and to a proper and decent concern with the happiness of peoples less favored than ourselves; the promise, if we persevere, is hope for emerging peoples and security for established peoples in a world struggling toward lasting peace and a genuine community of nations.

PUBLIC INFORMATION POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a report issued today by the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. This report criticizes in the strongest terms the public information policy of the Department of Defense which, it says, tries to tell the public that "everything's coming up roses."

I know of no greater danger to our freedom nor to our ultimate survival than an attempt by the Government, particularly by our military authorities, to confuse and delude the public by concealing unfavorable information. Whatever the bad news, sharing it with the American public is infinitely wiser than attempting to keep it from them.

The committee reports that "it has not been an encouraging year for freedom of information." In the Defense Department, it points at a directive requiring that a monitor be present at all Pentagon interviews and states that this practice is also carried out in the field. The committee shares the opinion voiced by Wes Gallagher, general manager of the Associated Press, who says such policies are "aimed not at security matters but at controlling what Americans fighting men say. Such control exceeds anything done in the darkest days of World War II."

Freedom of Information bills are now pending in the House and Senate. Hearings have been completed on H.R. 5012 by the Freedom on Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. No action has been taken as yet on S. 1160.

A free society, resting as it does on the ultimate wisdom of the people, cannot survive if the people are not well informed. Their judgment is limited by scope of their understanding of public issues, and it is the job of the Nation's newspapers to expand the scope of the people's knowledge and understanding.

The job of obtaining and disseminating information with reasonable impartiality and restraint is always difficult. One major problem, which grows as our Government grows, is the inherent desire of the Government to cover up some aspects of its operations and reveal only what it wants to reveal.

This is a natural tendency. Anyone wants to present only their best side, and is not anxious to have some particulars of their actions subjected to public view.

Especially this is a tendency of governments, which automatically clutch to their bosoms every shred of information about their operations and thus maintain their dominance over the people. Even aside from trying to quell criticism, hiding government information from the people makes them more dependent and less able or likely to resist the actions of the existing regime.

There is an old saying that "Doctors bury their mistakes; and the Government classifies its mistakes."

Of course there is information which must be kept secret so as not to aid our enemies. Strangely, however, many things which clearly are known to our enemies are kept secret from our own people.

The more I have observed the Washington scene, the more convinced I have become that it takes constant watching to keep the Government from becoming extremely secretive about its operations. As our Government grows to mammoth proportions we have to watch at every level at every moment.

The Freedom of Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has been of great help in this endeavor. It is often tipped off to attempted efforts at unnecessary Government secrecy by enterprising members of the press who are seeking to get the full story.

Mistakes will be made in our Government, of course. Sometimes they may damage our prestige and impair basic confidence in our Government. But nothing is so bad as the attempt to keep full information about them from the people.

For their unceasing efforts to keep the people informed, ripping apart the veil of secrecy which is often used to conceal official acts, the press of the Nation is much to be congratulated.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO REMOVE EXCISE TAXES ON RETAIL PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I urge passage of legislation to remove the excise taxes on such retail items as ladies handbags, jewelry, cosmetics, furs, and related commodities, and am introducing legislation to accomplish this purpose.

The 10 percent excise taxes levied on these products are collected for the IRS by retail merchants. To eliminate these taxes will eliminate excess bookkeeping imposed on American businessmen as well as offer tax relief for the overburdened U.S. taxpayer.

These excise taxes have outlived their original purpose as they apply to commodities once considered luxuries but now regarded as necessities. It is worth noting, for example, that although a Federal excise tax is applied on the sale of women's handbags now taxed under the category of luggage, the Army, Navy, and Air Force issue handbags as part of the clothing for their women personnel.

Last year Americans paid out nearly \$185 million in taxes on jewelry. Many of the items taxed under this category were birthday gifts or Christmas presents, and it is my understanding that this category has been extended so far as to include ornamental buttons on women's dresses.

The 1964 fur sales totaled approximately \$30 million, and while furs are taxed as a luxury item, many cloth coats and dresses costing much more were not taxed.

I have also urged that legislation removing the excise tax on cosmetics, perfumes, and other toiletries be enacted. Removal of the 10 percent tax now imposed on these products would have great effect in view of the more than \$6 million spent by the American consumer last year on these items. To remove the tax on this category would not only cut the price on articles used by women, but lower the price of men's after-shave lotion as well.

I am hopeful that the House Ways and Means Committee will act on this matter before June 30 in order that some tax relief may be granted.

IMPORT QUOTAS FOR FOREIGN-PRODUCED RESIDUAL OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 the Secretary of the Interior announced at a press conference that import quotas for foreign-produced residual oil are being increased by "somewhere in the range of 75,000 barrels a day which is somewhat comparable to the increase of last year." On the following day, April 1, the opening day of the residual oil import control year, the Department of the Interior issued a statement indicating a daily increase amounting to about 115,000 barrels per day.

According to my calculations, the difference between the Secretary's announcement of a 75,000-barrel-per-day increase in residual oil import quotas and the Department's statement showing an increase of 115,000 barrels daily is something more than 53 percent. The net effect is to place on very shaky ground the entire import quota program as it is administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

This is especially true in view of the Secretary's comments at his press conference. It would appear from what he told the press that he is tired of the program and would like very much to do away with the whole thing. As a matter of fact, he was moving in that direction—by his own admission—but was sidetracked by the intervention of administration lawyers, including those in the White House.

The Secretary has said, in effect, that the whole quota system will be eliminated when a "basic determination" is made that the "national security no longer warrants the program." He had this to say specifically at his March 31 press conference:

There is in my judgment a very serious question whether the national security warrants the continuation of this program and this was reflected in the initial decision that I had made. However, a national security determination is not something that is within my power, acting alone, to make . . . nor did I approach it in terms of making this type of basic decision.

Mr. Speaker, the initial decision made by the Secretary of the Interior concerning future imports of foreign residual oil into the United States—the decision he himself described as the best solution—

was to eliminate import quotas in five New England States, exclusive of Connecticut, and in the State of Florida, and to modify the program in the remaining States of district I. But he was overruled, he said, by administration lawyers, including White House lawyers, "because of the national security basis of the program" and because his "best solution" was not "legally viable."

It is obvious that we have in the present administration an official who is charged with administration of a critically important program about which he professes to understand little in terms of its relationship to the security of this Nation. If the Secretary had not been overruled only 48 hours before he made his announcement, chaos would have reigned supreme in those segments of our economy from which we draw vitally needed fuels, and I have particular reference to the coal industry.

We hear arguments to the effect that unwarranted dependence on foreign sources of fuel could mean trouble in a serious international emergency. Even with the naval strength we have in the Atlantic, vessels carrying residual oil to our east coast ports would be particularly vulnerable to submarine attack. Residual oil burning generating stations and industrial plants would be forced to curtail operations because of the resulting fuel shortages.

I subscribe to this argument, of course. But I suggest that this argument alone does not point with sufficient emphasis to the critical national security aspects of fuel supplies. Lacking imported oil, consumers in New England and Florida, and elsewhere, too, would be forced to turn to other fuels.

Mr. Speaker, the one fuel to which utilities and industrial plants would turn in an emergency is coal. However, even though we have some 830 billion tons of coal unmined in this country, the coal industry cannot fill the void overnight. Coal would not be instantly available to replace the foreign residual oil if the Secretary's views were to prevail and if all quota restrictions were to be removed.

In order to meet suddenly increased demands, the coal industry would have to open new mines, employ additional miners, order new equipment, and wait for it to be built and delivered. This takes time which might not be available in abundance.

Such a situation can be avoided, simply and directly, by insisting, here in the Congress, that the residual oil import control program be retained on a long-term basis and that quotas be set and maintained at reasonable levels which permit all domestic fuels—including coal—to compete for the growing energy market in the East. Imports have been increasing at a rate of about 9 percent yearly, and the Secretary of the Interior himself said one of the reasons for the increased daily import quota starting April 1 was "for the growth factor increase that is normal."

The Secretary thus grants to residual oil importers first crack at the growing energy market in New England, New York, and New Jersey where residual oil

consumption has increased 21 percent since 1958 during the same period the coal market in that part of the country fell sharply. The result of the ever-increasing quotas has been the dumping of residual at east coast ports at prices designed to undercut coal and drive it from the market.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, if the quota restrictions are removed, as the Secretary would like, foreign residual oil will be everywhere in the northeastern corner of our Nation, and coal's present market for some 39 million tons yearly will all but disappear. Who will be penalized then? Will the Nation be stronger when the coal industry has been weakened?

If the coal industry is not permitted to compete in the northeastern fuel markets on an equitable basis, it simply cannot afford to prepare to meet the heavy production demands that would be imposed upon it in the event of a national emergency. Estimates show that a capital investment of from \$10 to \$12 per ton of annual coal production is required to open a new mine, and the coal industry officials with whom I am acquainted are prepared to make such investments only if they can be assured of market conditions which justify the required outlays.

The coal industry has no desire to prohibit entirely the importation of foreign residual oil, but it does urge that the import control program be administered with proper concern for the present and future welfare of the people who work in and are supported by this country's vital coal mines. This can be done by stabilizing imports at a reasonable level rather than increasing quotas at every opportunity.

A stabilized residual oil import program would assure those industries and installations which now burn oil that sufficient quantities would be available as protection against fuel scarcity. It would enable all domestic fuel industries, including the coal industry, to plan for the future on an intelligent and predictable basis featuring equitable consideration for all concerned. It would give the coal industry, especially, an opportunity to compete for a fair share of the market now glutted with residual oil, thus providing needed employment in the mines and in coal-carrying railroads. Most of all, it would safeguard national security by permitting intelligent planning by all parties to cope with any situation involving wartime cessation of imports.

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a war on poverty costing \$1.5 billion. And we are engaged at the same time in a program costing additional millions of dollars to eliminate economic stagnation in the coal-rich Appalachian region. We are told these programs are necessary if the Nation is to be made stronger and more secure.

Simultaneously, however, the Secretary of the Interior seeks to endanger national security by attempting to allow certain portions of this country to place total and entire dependence on foreign oil at a time when the national security demands strengthening of our domestic fuel industries so that they may be able

to meet emergency demands at some future time. I fail to see the logic behind the Secretary's reasoning, and I believe my feeling is shared by many of my colleagues.

I am happy to learn that the Office of Emergency Planning is looking into the national security aspects of the oil import control program. I am confident that this agency will look at all the facts coldly and objectively, with the welfare of the Nation in mind, and will recommend that the program be continued in the national interest. If the OEP seeks expert judgment on the relationship of national security to this program, I am certain it will not seek advice from the Secretary of the Interior who by his own words has eliminated himself as an expert in the field.

VERRAZANO DAY, APRIL 17, 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I take particular pleasure each year in joining with my Italian-American friends in paying tribute to that great explorer, Giovanni da Verrazano, whose discoveries played such an important part in our American history.

Verrazano can truly be heralded as the great "martyr of exploration." This intrepid 29-year-old navigator was not one to rest on his well-won laurels. After having completed a series of explorations of the North American coast all the way from Cape Fear northward to Cape Breton, Verrazano set forth on a similar exploring expedition to the Southern Hemisphere. The people of the world long pondered the outcome of this journey for it still remains shrouded in mystery. Historians can tell us only that in all likelihood Verrazano was killed and probably eaten by natives on the "island of Darien" off Panama.

The widespread public interest in Verrazano and the genuine appreciation of his important contribution to the development of our country motivated the administration to honor his name with a commemorative stamp last fall.

The great Narrows Bridge which bears his name will be a constant reminder to all who traverse it of the young man who was first to explore and chart for posterity the waters in and around New York as well as Narragansett Bay.

Mr. Speaker, when we think of Verrazano and when we honor him for his great deeds, we think of the hundreds and hundreds of other great men of Italian birth or descent who have done so much for America. The memory of these fine Americans creates a chain of thought which immediately relates itself to our whole process of immigration.

President Lyndon B. Johnson in meeting last fall with the group of Italian-American leaders seeking to obtain approval of the commemorative stamp for Verrazano said:

Two years ago this month I visited the city of Naples. There I was privileged to speak to and meet with several hundred families who were leaving their native land to become citizens of our land.

There is no more difficult decision men can make than to leave their homeland—and their family ties to begin life anew in another land. In this office, I think always of the more than 40 million men and women who since 1820 have made that choice. A President has no greater duty than to use every strength and talent to keep America as a land to which many will want to come—and none will want to leave.

We must have laws regarding immigration. Personally, I believe our laws should not say that the relatives of any Americans are not welcome to become Americans themselves. We are committed to eliminating discrimination in our society. I believe we should also eliminate discrimination in the laws relating to those who would join our society from abroad.

The strength of our Nation has been built from many groups from many lands.

No group has contributed more—few have contributed so much—as the sons and daughters of Italy.

Mr. Speaker, as we recall these words of the President and as our hearts join with our Italian-American friends in gratitude and tribute to Verrazano, may we remind ourselves that this Congress has an unfinished task of utmost importance. We cannot and we must not ignore the President's request for legislative action to revise and update our inadequate and discriminatory immigration laws. When we complete this vital task we can feel that we have somewhat repaid our obligation to the great martyr of exploration—Giovanni da Verrazano.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE FREE MAILING OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS FOR THOSE WHO ARE HOUSEBOUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code in order to authorize the free mailing of books and periodicals between public libraries and individuals who are housebound.

This bill is designated to make it possible for shut-ins to receive adequate library service in their home communities through the mail without having the cost of postage for this service deter local libraries from instituting it because of budgetary problems.

Some community libraries have begun using bookmobiles as a means of bringing library service to people in their home neighborhoods. However, these bookmobiles usually park in a specific place to serve people who live within a radius of several blocks. Since it is impossible for shut-ins who are too ill, disabled, or infirm to walk several blocks to the bookmobile, and since it is not always possible or desirable for shut-ins to arrange for someone to select books for them, library service by mail is the only logical and efficient solution to providing adequate library services for housebound individuals.

My bill would require the shut-in individual to furnish to the librarian or

chief administrative officer of his local public library, the statement of a physician attesting to the fact that the individual is permanently housebound owing to illness or disability or that he will be confined to his home for medical reasons for a period of not less than three months' duration. The bill would also require that the book or periodical be clearly marked "Free Matter for the Disabled" in the upper right-hand corner of the address area. Thus, with these provisions, the service would be simple to operate by both the library and the Post Office Department. Similar free and reduced postage rate privileges for books and equipment for the use of blind persons have been in operation since 1899 and have been most helpful to these persons.

The need for this bill to assist shut-ins was brought to my attention by F. William Summers, associate librarian of the Providence Public Library. I am sure that a similar need exists in every community throughout our country.

I am sure that all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join with me in supporting this urgently needed legislation as a means of stimulating adequate library service to shut-ins, the group of individuals who, perhaps more than any other, need ready access to books and periodical literature.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on April 26 and April 27; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SKUBITZ.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. KELLY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 19, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

940. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 6, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of the Atlantic Coast from the Delaware-Maryland line to Gargathy Inlet, Va., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 144); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

941. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 26, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of the Rhode Island coastal and tidal areas, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 145); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 10 illustrations.

942. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 5, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of the Connecticut coastal and tidal areas, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with six illustrations.

943. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 1, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Tittabawassee River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 27, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

944. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

945. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsections (a) and (b) and to repeal subsection (f) of Section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish the Rural Electrification Administration Loan Account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

946. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of a soil survey and land classification of lands in the Baker project, Oreg., pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

947. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary requisitioning of aeronautical parts by the Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, Western Pacific Area, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

948. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the

reclassification of certain lands of the Tulelake Irrigation District, pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (act of Aug. 4, 1939, ch. 418, 53 Stat. 1187, 43 U.S.C. 485); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

949. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notice of the receipt of a loan application from the Roosevelt Water Conservation District of Higley, Ariz., pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2984. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2985. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers; with amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2986. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 324. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 250). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 305. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the designation of a grove of redwood trees as a memorial to the late Dag Hammarskjöld; without amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 7519. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital park system in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 7520. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive

community mental health centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 7522. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review the report on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in Louisiana and Texas to determine whether certain modifications should be made in that project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 7523. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 7524. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7525. A bill to provide certain free mailing privileges with respect to books, periodicals, and other reading matter mailed between libraries and other nonprofit organizations and persons confined by illness or disability to their places of abode; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7526. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 7527. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 7528. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 7529. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 7530. A bill to provide Federal assistance to restore and repair certain disaster areas in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7531. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 7532. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7533. A bill to provide Federal assistance to restore and repair certain disaster areas in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 7534. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7535. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 7536. A bill to provide Federal assistance to restore and repair certain disaster areas in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 7537. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7538. A bill to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7539. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7540. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital parks system in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7541. A bill to provide Federal assistance to restore and repair certain disaster areas in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 7542. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 340. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 341. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 3584, a bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H. Res. 342. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H. Res. 343. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study with respect to all aspects of the proposed closing of the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

203. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of

Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the cities and towns of the Commonwealth to mail absentee ballots free of postage charges, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 7543. A bill for the relief of Stephan N. Bilezikjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7544. A bill for the relief of Marara Potete Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 7545. A bill to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to William Sima and Thelma L. Sima in Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7546. A bill for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7547. A bill for the relief of Han Chin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7548. A bill for the relief of Ming Sing Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

169. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Hawaii National Guard Noncommissioned Officers Association, Fort Ruger, Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to stating that the Legislature of the State of Hawaii urges and strongly supports increased pay for personnel of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

170. Also, petition of Choko Kuwae, Representative, the 15th Islandwide Mandataries Conference, relative to obtaining compensation for damages caused by U.S. Forces and members thereof while in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

171. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to safe and unsafe areas in the United States during this nuclear age; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday last, the Chair declares the Senate adjourned until 9 o'clock a.m. Monday next.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 13 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Tuesday, April 13, 1965, until Monday, April 19, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Verrazano Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on or about April 17, 1524, 441 years ago, an adventurous Florentine navigator sailed his ship into New York Harbor and sent a small boat through the Narrows to explore what we call today Upper New York Bay. The name of the navigator was Giovanni Verrazano.

Long before the voyages of Raleigh, Hudson, and the Pilgrims, Verrazano and his intrepid companions came to the shores of North America, explored these shores, and reported their findings to Europe. For centuries, Americans remained ignorant of this exploit. The name they gave to their continent evoked the voyages of Amerigo Vespucci. They set aside a day to commemorate the discoveries of Christopher Columbus. But neither of these great explorers—who contributed so largely to the renown of Italian navigation—came to the shores of what today is the northeastern coast of the United States. It is to Verrazano that credit belongs for first exploring this coast.

Belatedly, Americans have come to recognize the achievements of Verrazano. In 1909, a statue of Verrazano was unveiled in Battery Park in New York City. In 1964, a suspension bridge across the Narrows of New York Harbor was completed, bearing appropriately the name of

Verrazano. It is my hope that one day all our citizens will be acquainted with the exploits of Verrazano, and that his name will be set alongside those of Columbus and Vespucci when the glorious history of Italian navigation is evoked.

Report to Kansas on H.R. 6675

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to the people of Kansas on H.R. 6675:

REPORT TO KANSAS

The House of Representatives, on April 8, passed the administration's hospital and medical services bill. Although President Johnson has recommended that Congress enact a limited hospital care program—the Ways and Means Committee, apparently with the President's blessing, came forth with one of the most far-reaching medicare programs ever to reach the floor of the House.

Let's not kid ourselves. When this bill becomes law, the soundness of the social security pension program will be in real jeopardy.

It has always been my feeling that we have a responsibility to provide hospital and medical care for all our people, young and old, who are in need of such assistance. We have a responsibility to assist our senior citizens who are able to care for their ordinary expenses of living, but who live in constant fear of a major illness, which might wipe out their savings, and force them to

become public charges—and such assistance should be given without embarrassment or humiliation to those who need help.

Hence, the real issue before the Congress during the debate on H.R. 6675, insofar as I was concerned, was not whether we should provide assistance but how we should provide assistance.

The administration bill was brought to the floor under a closed rule which permitted 10 hours of discussion but denied to House Members the right to offer amendments, to remove objectionable provisos, clarify ambiguities or improve it. Hence, a Member was required to vote "yes" or "no" on the whole package. With a single exception, the minority was permitted to offer one amendment in the form of a motion to recommit. Under these circumstances, the minority offered the Byrnes bill as an alternative proposal.

The administration program and the Byrnes alternative both included the provisions of H.R. 11865 which passed the House last year (and I supported it) providing for (a) an increase in social security benefits, (b) lowered the retirement age to 60 years for widows, (c) provided social security benefits for those over 72 years of age, and (d) continued benefits to dependent children up to 22 years of age if in school. Both bills provided for a voluntary insurance program for medical (physicians) care. Both bills provided for hospital care. In fact, the Byrnes proposal was far more liberal since it provided for catastrophic illnesses and medicals—these were not included in the administration's bill, H.R. 6675.

The major difference in the two programs was not so much in the benefits provided but in the method of financing. The administration bill provided that hospital care for those over 65 should be paid through an additional payroll tax attached to social security by those who now pay social security but who would not be entitled to any benefits until they reach 65. The Byrnes proposal, which I supported, provided that those over 65 should pay one-third of the hospital and medical care insurance premium (average

\$6.50 per month) and the Government would pay two-thirds of the cost out of the general fund of the Treasury. It was the same program provided by the Government today for Members of Congress and Federal employees.

It was agreed by some that if we could give aid to the nations all over the world, if we could pay benefits to labor, industry, and agriculture, if we could assist Federal employees, then we could subsidize the medical needs of the aged to meet their medical costs. The question has also been raised why should a worker with two dependents and earning \$3,600 per year be required to pay an income tax of \$214 and also hospitalization costs for a person on retirement who has an income of \$3,600, pays no income tax and contributes nothing toward the hospital care program.

I supported the Byrnes proposal. I could not in good conscience support the administration proposal which in my opinion undermines the whole social security structure and places unnecessary additional burden on those who now pay social security.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOSPITAL CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY?

Most of us have always considered social security as a program under which we would receive a pension at age 65—which combined with our life savings—would make it possible for us to maintain a decent standard of living during our years of retirement. When the program was first enacted in 1937, it held out much promise. But since then what has happened to social security?

Through the years we have so expanded and enlarged upon the original intent that, like Government bonds, it is rapidly losing its attractiveness. We now have on the books commitments to pay out approximately \$625 billion to those on retirement or covered by social security. We have in assets around \$305 billion. If all payments into the fund were to stop—we would be \$300 billion short to meet present commitments.

Instead of building up reserves, as private pension programs do, we have actually been paying out approximately as much as we have been taking in. We have continued not only to increase the social security rate but also the earnings base upon which the tax is paid. In 1954, when disability payments were added, we were told OASI trust funds would climb to \$28.5 billion by 1965—actually the fund is now estimated at around \$19 billion—\$7.5 billion short. And now we are enlarging the program by adding hospital care, increasing cash benefits and reducing the age requirements for widows.

Have pension payments kept pace with the increased social security payments made by the worker? The answer is "No." In 1939, an employee who earned \$550 per month paid \$30 per year into the social security fund. He could look forward to receiving \$58 per month on retirement. Today an employee earning the same amount pays \$174 into the social security fund and his maximum social security benefit is \$127 per month. By 1973, an employee earning \$550 per month will pay \$353 annually into the social security fund, and he will receive a maximum pension check of \$168. In other words while the cost has gone up 480 percent—the workers retirement check has increased only 119 percent.

What is there about social security that is attractive to the young man who is about to enter the labor force for the first time? One must remember that these are the workers upon whom we must depend to pay into the fund so that those over 65 may secure these benefits. A young man, 21 years of age, entering the labor force next year and paying the full amount of social security until 65, could have deposited the same amount in a building and loan at 4½ percent, and he would accumulate by retirement time an estimate of \$42,000. If we add the employer's share, it would be \$84,000. His retirement checks under social security would

total \$2,004 per annum. If he invested \$42,000 at 5 percent, he would earn \$2,100 annually and still leave an estate of \$42,000 at his death.

Can we keep expanding the social security program by adding hospital care, medical care, increasing benefits to those over 65, and charge it to social security? Yes, if those who pay into the fund are willing to stand for an increase in the payroll tax and the earning base upon which the tax is paid. It should be remembered, however, that the social security tax by 1971 will be as burdensome as the income tax. For example, take a man earning \$5,000 per year with a wife and two dependents—in 1971 his income tax will be approximately \$290 and his social security tax will be \$260. These, of course, will be increased when demands are made that Congress grant further increases in social security benefits to meet living costs, and as hospital and medical services increase in cost.

A hospital care program for those over 65 financed by a payroll tax attached to social security not only does serious damage to the social security pension program but it also inflicts the most unfair tax in our whole taxing system. The president of the corporation pays on the same basis as the plant janitor.

In closing may I repeat what I said in the beginning—I believe in providing hospital care and medical care for those who are in need. I want to help those who can care for themselves, but live in constant dread that one serious illness will place them on relief. But I want to do it without wrecking the social security pension system for those who are between the ages of 21 and 65 and are required to foot the bill. I do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. That is why I favored the financing provided by the Byrnes alternative and opposed the administration bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
April 19, 1965.

I hereby designate the Honorable HALE BOGGS to act as Speaker pro tempore today.
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, DD., prefaced his prayer with Acts 11: 24: *He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.*

Most merciful and gracious God, who art always guiding and guarding us in the difficult ways of life, may we commit ourselves gladly and faithfully to the wise and beneficent dispensation of Thy divine providence.

Inspire us with a triumphant faith in our search and struggle for the welfare of all mankind and may we be fearless

and undisturbed in the midst of life's frustrations and confusions because of Thy sustaining grace and our trust in Thee.

May we always seek to coordinate our freedom with restraint and self-discipline and may we be unswervingly loyal to the highest ideals of democracy and the leading of Thy Holy Spirit.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 15, 1965, was read and approved.

BIG DAYS ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, the New York Post published an editorial entitled "Big Days on Capitol Hill." The editorial said some very complimentary things about the work of this Congress. I think that there is a great deal of merit to these comments and I am inserting them in the RECORD so that

these views will gain an audience all over the country:

BIG DAYS ON CAPITOL HILL

1. VICTORY FOR MEDICARE

Overwhelming House approval of the Medicare bill is, in President Johnson's words, "a landmark day in the historic evolution of our social security system." It is also a tribute to the President's skillful legislative hand.

Passage of the measure by so decisive a margin virtually insures its enactment; no serious obstacles are anticipated in the Senate, where such legislation was approved in 1964.

Thus, a long, memorable battle, begun under Harry Truman and pressed by John F. Kennedy, draws to a triumphant close. Despite the propaganda war cries of the American Medical Association, the measure embodies no revolutionary change in our social structure; private medical business will go on as usual. But citizens over 65 will have the chance to obtain reasonable protection and treatment too often denied.

"The people do not understand this bill," lamented Dr. Dunovan F. Ward, president of the AMA, when he heard the news of the House action.

He is wrong. The people finally rejected the political quackery so long practiced by the AMA lobby. The issue was fought out clearly in the presidential campaign, and it was basically resolved in the Johnson landslide. How many more dollars will the AMA invest in its dreary lost cause?

2. NEW ADVANCES ON VOTING RIGHTS

There is growing prospect that the voting rights bill so eloquently advocated by President Johnson in his memorable "we